FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Latin America

EARTH SUMMIT '92

U.N. Conference on Environment and Development

FBIS-LAT-92-118-S
Thursday
18 June 1992

Latin America
SUPPLEMENT
EARTH SUMMIT '92
U.N. Conference on Environment and Development

FBIS-LAT-92-118-S *18 June 1992*

CONTENTS

4-16 June Activities at UNCED

Brazil's Collor Talks About Environment *[Tokyo NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN 5 Jun]* 1
World Bank Head Urges Japan Contribution *[Tokyo NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN 7 Jun]* 1
Dalai Lama Discusses Earth Summit, Environment
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 5 Jun] 1
Arab Countries Propose Change in Climate Treaty
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 6 Jun] 2
Heads of State Arrive in Rio on 6 Jun *[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 7 Jun]* 2
EC To Be 'Bridge' Against U.S. 'Isolation' *[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 7 Jun]* 2
Brazilian Foreign Minister on Summit Resolutions
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 9 Jun] 3
Amazonas Governor Says Greenpeace 'Ecofascist'
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 8 Jun] 3
Parliamentary Meeting To Assess Earth Summit *[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 9 Jun]* ... 4
Negotiation of Agenda 21 Chapters Detailed *[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 9 Jun,etc]* 4
UN Secretary General Grants Interview *[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 14 Jun]* 4
Castro "Believes" Bush's Presence Helped UNCED
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 15 Jun] 6
Castro Talks About Environment, World Situation
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 16 Jun] 6
Fidel Castro Issues 'Message' to UNCED *[Havana PRENSA LATINA]* 11
Cuban Official Refers to U.S. Isolation *[Havana PRENSA LATINA]* 29
Croatia's Greguric Discusses Ecological Problems
[Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL 14 Jun] 29
Israeli Delegation Head Sums Up Earth Summit *[Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST 16 Jun]* .. 30

4-16 June Activities at UNCED

Brazil's Collor Talks About Environment

OW0806134092 Tokyo NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN in Japanese 5 Jun 92 Evening Edition p 1—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

['Report' on interview with Brazilian President Fernando Collor de Mello by reporter Hirata in Rio de Janeiro on 4 June]

[Text] Rio de Janeiro, 4 June—Brazilian President Collor, who is chairing the UNCED, granted an exclusive interview to a NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN reporter in Rio de Janeiro on 4 June. In the interview, the Brazilian president said: "Japan's participation in the Earth Summit is of great significance." As for the question of sharing the burden for a global environmental conservation fund, which is the main focus of the Earth Summit, President Collor called on the Japanese Government to display its leadership and express its intention to share a proper burden. Regarding the question of tackling global environmental problems, the president stressed his position that the poverty of developing nations should be eliminated first.

With regard to the Earth Summit, which is being held with about 180 nations and international organizations participating, President Collor pointed out: "What is most significant is that participating nations affirm their political resolve to save the earth." In addition, the president called upon industrial and developing nations to cooperate with each other in defusing their sharp confrontation over the question of sharing the burden for an assistance fund which is said to require $125 billion a year.

As regards cooperation between the North and South, the president reiterated his view that "industrialized nations need to have a full understanding of the reality that they are destroying the environment which is necessary for their survival." Thus the president emphasized that financial aid by industrial nations is indispensable to enable developing nations to develop their economies while preserving the environment. The president said: "In particular Japan, which has economic power as well as political potential, bears an important role." He then asked Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa to attend the Earth Summit to display his leadership in building an international consensus.

On the U.S. Government's stance—which has announced its decision not to sign the Biodiversity Treaty and is said to be negative about building a consensus at the Earth Summit—the president said: "President Bush's attendance at the summit itself indicates the United States intends to do something for preserving the global environment. I want to fully discuss this with the President."

World Bank Head Urges Japan Contribution

OW0806083192 Tokyo NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN in Japanese 7 Jun 92 Morning Edition p 1—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Report on "exclusive" interview with World Bank President Lewis Preston, by NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN in Rio de Janeiro on 5 June; reported by reporter Hirada]

[Text] Rio de Janeiro, 6 Jun—World Bank President Preston, who is here to attend the UNCED, granted an exclusive interview to NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN on 5 June. The bank president strongly called on the Japanese Government to speed up the flow of funds to developing countries as a way of helping global environment preservation efforts. He said: "I hope Japan will make contributions to global environment issues, recognizing its role as a country with current account in surplus."

Specifically, he referred to the question of the 10th capital increase planned by the International Development Association (IDA = Second World Bank) which is now predicted at about $18 billion. He asked for Japan's positive burden sharing in the capitalization.

The bank president noted that "Japan has so far been magnanimous in efforts to rescue the poorest nations," and hoped that Japan would cooperate appropriately as a current-account surplus country in the 10th capital increase of the IDA scheduled from 1993 to 1995. The 10th capital increase envisages securing an "earth increment" aimed at providing to the poorest nations increased funds to deal with environmental issues. Hence, as compared with the time of the ninth capital increase, the scale of increase will be greater, while strongly colored with environmental purposes.

As regards the question of increasing capital for the World Bank's Global Environment Fund (GEF) which is a focal topic at the Earth Summit, he merely said, "We are hoping to have positive cooperation at the time of making the capital increase next year."

Dalai Lama Discusses Earth Summit, Environment

PY0706003092 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 5 Jun 92 Ecology and City Section p 1—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with the Dalai Lama by Helena Salem; place and date not given]

[Excerpt] [Salem] How did you view the Chinese objection to your staying in Brazil at the same time as Prime Minister Li Peng during Rio-92?

[Dalai Lama] That always happens because the Tibet issue is a very sensitive issue for the Chinese.

[Salem] Nevertheless, were you satisfied with the solution that your departure from the country will coincide with Li Peng's arrival?

[Dalai Lama] I was unaware of those arrangements because I was not thinking of the time issue. In fact, things simply happened that way. I was invited to come here during the conference. I accepted the invitation and I just agreed with the dates that were finally established. It is possible that the Chinese marked their stay in Brazil based on my own stay. However, I will stay in Brazil for the time initially established and, if they decide to come later, that is another matter. I came without any precondition. I am always ready to talk, to discuss. Therefore, if there is a chance to meet the Chinese prime minister during my stay here, I would be completely available.

[Salem] Will the UN conference be in a position to effectively resolve the planet's great environmental problems?

[Dalai Lama] Even if the Earth Summit does not manage to resolve all the problems, the fact that it was held is already very important.

[Salem] There are not just a few, however, who claim that if Rio-92 fails, the Earth's survival will be jeopardized. What is your opinion?

[Dalai Lama] I don't know, don't know. The scientists are in a better position to talk about this. Nevertheless, there is a difference between the nuclear issue and the environmental issue. The nuclear threat was quite obvious and the people felt motivated to do something. Nevertheless, concerning the environmental issue, which is not so obvious, it is possible that nothing will be done. Therefore, the environment is being gradually undermined, and it could happen that the situation will reach such a point that when the people realize it, there will not be any solution anymore. And this worries me somewhat. I believe the leaders sometimes hesitate in making certain decisions on complex problems, in one way or another. [passage omitted]

Arab Countries Propose Change in Climate Treaty

PY0606220692 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 6 Jun 92 p Ecology and City Section p 2—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Text] Less than 24 hours after the opening for signing the Climate Changes Treaty, the Arab countries are threatening to abolish the effects of the document with a radical proposal: eliminate the text dealing with protection of the atmosphere from Agenda 21. After the first meeting of the group on the evening of 4 June, Saudi Arabia requested the withdrawal of Chapter 9, which establishes the programs and lines of action to fight air pollution.

The proposal submitted at the beginning of the debates took the "contact group" members by surprise because they still were under the effect of the solemn act in which President Fernando Collor opened the process for signing the treaty, which was followed by 11 countries. By yesterday 15 countries had signed the treaty and 55 more are on the list of countries that reported their decision to sign it.

With the support of other Arab countries, this position also received the sympathy of India, which suggested that if the chapter is not eliminated it should at least be reduced. The proposal created a controversy among the group members, who spent two hours of their first meeting debating the issue.

With instructions to oppose any proposal to reopen discussions that already were negotiated in the Rio-92 preparatory meeting in New York, the Brazilian delegation was the first to resist the chapter's elimination.

"The chapter on protection of the atmosphere is one of the broadest of Agenda 21, and if we begin to simplify it now we will conclude after the conference has ended," said one of the Brazilian negotiators who was informed of the Saudi proposal. According to the Brazilian diplomat, the Arab countries' proposal was the last card to try to block the Agenda 21 items that discourage the use of oil.

This afternoon the representatives of the countries attending the Rio conference who make up the specific group on protection of the atmosphere are debating the Saudi proposal.

Heads of State Arrive in Rio on 6 Jun

PY1006203292 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 7 Jun 92 p 1—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Editorial Report] The following heads of state and personalities arrived on 6 June in Rio de Janeiro to attend the Earth Summit: Mozambican President Joaquim Alberto Chissano, Byelarusian President Stanislav Shushkevich, Icelandic President Vigdis Finnbogadottir, Bhutanese Princess Sonan Chhoden Wangchuck, Tanzanian President Ali Hassan Mwinyi, Ethiopian Prime Minister Layne Tamirat, Saudi Prince Bin-'Abd-al-Aziz (Salman) [as published], Prime Minister Gourad Hamadou Barkat of Djibouti, Cook Islands Prime Minister Geoffrey A. Henry, Guinea-Bissau President Joao Bernardo Vieira, and Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer.

EC To Be 'Bridge' Against U.S. 'Isolation'

PY0806022892 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 7 Jun 92 p 1—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Excerpt] The EC has decided to make a diplomatic effort to try to pull the United States out of an embarrassing isolation at Rio-92. "We would not like to leave the United States alone," EC delegation chief Laurens Jan Brinkhorst said after announcing that the EC will try to "work as a bridge" between the United States and its adversaries at the conference. The EC representatives fear that ostracism of the United States may threaten the conference's success. [passage omitted]

Brazilian Foreign Minister on Summit Resolutions

PY1006033892 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 9 Jun 92 Ecology Section p 3—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[By Luis Orlando Carneiro]

[Text] Foreign Minister Celso Lafer on 8 June listed three questions that he believes to be important in the Rio-92 Conference: the agreement regarding a conference to be held in the short term to approve a convention that will discuss desertification once Agenda 21 is implemented; the creation within the sphere of the UN's Economic-Social Council of a functional commission at the ministerial level to monitor the resolutions of the Rio Conference; and the understanding between the Group of 77 (developing countries) and the East European countries that wanted an "excessively specific" debate on the new environmental order.

During a news conference he gave after lunching with Ambassador Tommy Koh, president of the conference's main committee, Lafer admitted that there are still "difficulties" in obtaining a commitment from the rich countries in the Financial Resources Committee to guarantee a contribution of 0.7 percent of their GDP [gross domestic product] by the year 2000 in order to "pay the bill" of the outcome of the Rio de Janeiro conference.

In addition to the Climate Changes and Biodiversity Treaties, which already have been signed by a large number of the participating countries, the problem of desertification submitted by the African countries has had a consensual acceptance, and, according to the foreign minister, a treaty on this topic will be given priority treatment. The agreement to reduce the preferential treatment that the East European countries want during their transition to a market economy has been approved in principle, and it will be submitted by the main committee to the plenum on the night of 10 June. The questions of financial resources and the declaration or treaty on forests (which the United States wants) still have to be resolved.

Amazonas Governor Says Greenpeace 'Ecofascist'

PY1106225992 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 8 Jun 92 Ecology and City Section p 2—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with Amazonas State Governor Gilberto Mestrinho by Gilberto Scofield Jr. in Rio de Janeiro—date not given]

[Excerpts] [Scofield] What happened to the governor who considered Rio-92 [UN Conference on Environment and Development] a forum for innocuous discussions and threatened to boycott the conference with a parallel event in Amazonas State?

[Mestrinho] He remains the same. It happens that the government's stance on the Amazon region has changed a lot. Part of this change also was due to the discussions that preceded the conference in Rio de Janeiro. The international consensus that Brazil is an anti-ecological country because it burns its Amazon forests no longer exists today. Today, everyone knows that barely 8.5 percent of the forests have been affected by some type of environmental aggression. In Amazonas State, which is three times larger than France, this percentage has been reduced to 1.24 percent.

[Scofield] Thus, the conference has become extremely productive.

[Mestrinho] This is not so either. If there is no consensus about the conference's most controversial points, such as global warming, biodiversity, or the exchange of technologies, our discussions will be worthless and everything will remain the same. Nevertheless, there is a positive point: The myth of Brazil being a forest destroyer has ended. And, on the other hand, no one thinks of maintaining forests as something sacred. Even the Brazilian Government already admits today that the forests are no longer untouchable and signals action on this huge natural resource with rational uses. [Environment Secretary and Education] Minister Goldemberg is very competent and he is a man with clear ideas. Ibama's [Brazilian Institute for Environmental Affairs and Renewable Natural Resources] new president, Maria Tereza [Padua], is also fairly competent. In this regard, Rio-92 opened a space for the Amazon region's growth.

[Scofield] Nevertheless, some countries, especially the richest ones, continue endorsing the thesis that forests are a universal patrimony.

[Mestrinho] Exactly. All of us know this. There are pressure groups in rich countries interested in maintaining the forests unexploited, leaving the 17 million inhabitants in this region miserable or, in case of unilateral exploration, without compensation.

[Scofield] Who are these pressure groups?

[Mestrinho] They are large industrial corporations from the mining and lumber sectors and biogenetic banks. Hence, when cassiterite began to be mined in the Amazon region, tin prices plunged from $12 to $6 per kg. The large mining companies in Malaysia and Thailand were bewildered. This is the reason for the pressure—the same pressure exerted by the large U.S., Canadian, or Finnish lumber companies.

[Scofield] What is the most important point for the [Amazon] region in the Rio-92 discussions?

[Mestrinho] No doubt, biodiversity. The laboratories want to continue exploiting our biogenetic genes and sell us extremely expensive medicine without any compensation. Last year, the pharmaceutical industry invoiced $200 billion, using active components obtained from plants. Of this total, at least 80 percent were genes obtained from tropical forest plants. Nevertheless, this

will change. We are creating a Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering Center in Amazonas State. [passage omitted]

[Scofield] What is your opinion of the Greenpeace organization?

[Mestrinho] They are ecofascists [ecofacistas]. They are basing their claims on theories that no longer have the required scientific basis. Furthermore, the entire convention is discussing theories without an exhaustively proven scientific basis. For example, they say that the ozone layer is becoming thinner, but a NASA study recently demonstrated that the layer has become thicker. The cosmetics industry became involved in the preparation of protective creams they are now stuck with. There are contradictory reports. Some scientists claim that the ozone layer hole over Antarctica is due to a normal solar radiation cycle. Therefore, all of us can be astonished by things that are not true. Nevertheless, all this is quite ironic.

[Scofield] Why?

[Mestrinho] Why is no one evaluating the impact of atomic tests on the atmosphere? Because this is a prerogative of the rich. No one deals with this issue, and everyone works hard on issues that are poorly resolved scientifically. [passage omitted]

Parliamentary Meeting To Assess Earth Summit

PY1106192792 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 9 Jun 92 Ecology Section p 4—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Excerpt] Deputy Ulysses Guimaraes, president of the Brazilian Nucleus of the Interparliamentary Union [Nucleo Brasileiro da Uniao Interparlamentar], announced the decision to hold a meeting in Brasilia in November with the participation of lawmakers worldwide to assess the measures adopted during the Rio-92 [UN Conference on Environment and Development] conference. He made this announcement during the 8 June session of the Earth Summit. The Interparliamentary Meeting on Environment and Development, as it has been called, is scheduled to be held at Congress on 23-28 November. [passage omitted]

Negotiation of Agenda 21 Chapters Detailed

PY1006233692—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Editorial Report] Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese on 9 June 1992 publishes in the Ecology Section on p 3 a 250-word article entitled "The United Kingdom Vetoes Article on Technology." It states that "an agreement signed by all countries on one of the most controversial subjects of Agenda 21—the chapter on the transfer of technology between rich and poor countries—was vetoed yesterday at the last minute by the United Kingdom." It adds that an agreement had been reached on Article 18-E on the acquisition of technology. This agreement called for developed countries to hand over technologies whenever they are indemnified. According to Brazilian diplomats, this mechanism will avoid the abuse of economic power. But when everyone expected the item to be approved, because not even the United States objected, the UK representative said, "we have to consult London."

Moreover, the article states that the Group of 7, G-7, countries were adamant about the need to place the verb "assure" in all items being negotiated on the transfer of environmentally rational technology. Brazilian Ambassador Celso Amorim said that G-7 countries are concerned about the degree of commitment. He said that 70 percent of the text already has been studied and approved, and that it will be closed by 10 June.

Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese on 9 June 1992 publishes in the Environment Section on p 2 a 150-word article stating that fishing on the high seas will be the subject of a new treaty to be discussed within the next 18 months. It adds: "This is the main agreement reached in the negotiations on Agenda 21 to conclude the text of the chapter on the protection of oceans."

The article states that negotiations led by Canada defeated the opposition of the United States, Japan, and other EEC that preferred to uphold the Rights of the Seas Treaty signed in Caracas, Venezuela, 10 years ago. The new treaty will restrict the volume of fishing on the high seas and prohibit the changing of flags outside territorial seas.

UN Secretary General Grants Interview

PY1506223492 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 14 Jun 92 Ecology and City Section p 2—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with UN Secretary General Butrus Butrus-Ghali by Helena Salem; place and date not given]

[Text] [Salem] What will be the world situation after the UNCED?

[Butrus-Ghali] I believe that the world will be different after the Rio conference and that this conference helped to create a consensus on the importance of a new bargain between mankind and the Earth. The attitude of nations toward discussing environmental issues will be different after the Rio conference.

[Salem] The world has been divided already into socialist and capitalist blocs; there is a huge split between the rich and the poor. Could the isolated position of the United States and the independent attitude of Europe during the Rio-92 conference entail a new reorganization of the world? Did the environment lead to a difference of positions?

[Butrus-Ghali] No. We are referring to two different issues. I am talking about the Rio conference. I believe that a specific problem on the relationship between

mankind and nature will exist "before and after the Rio conference." This relationship will change because there is a new awareness, and if we do not respect it we will be unable to preserve the planet.

[Salem] But countries react in different ways to environmental problems.

[Butrus-Ghali] Yes, but they are just details. All countries are aware that it is necessary to adopt a new attitude toward the environment. Some countries signed certain treaties and others did not. In general, the macroeconomic viewpoint will change, and in this regard what is important is not what has or has not been signed. What is important is the task to be undertaken after the Rio conference and the way we will act to implement the different recommendations made at the conference.

[Salem] How will it be done?

[Butrus-Ghali] I can only speak on behalf of the United Nations, which is ready to assume responsibility for the decisions made.

[Salem] Will the United Nations have the necessary power to implement the decisions not approved by a great power like the United States, as in the case of the Biodiversity Treaty?

[Butrus-Ghali] I am referring to the entire process and not to one or another convention. We will try to adopt or defend a new attitude on environmental problems. We took the most difficult step. The United States is just a UN member. The United States will maintain the attitude that they formulated, and we will push the UN member countries in that direction. The real work will be made by the UN member countries.

[Salem] But developing countries have no representatives on the UN Security Council, for example. The poorest countries are the ones who are more concerned with biodiversity.

[Butrus-Ghali] The Rio conference showed that we share a common interest, that we are all on the same ship. We seek the same objective despite how a country may tackle the issue. Otherwise, I would say that the Rio conference offered a new foundation for a new dialogue between the North and the South.

[Salem] How do you view Europe's independent position with respect to the United States at the conference, a position which was contrary to that adopted during the Gulf war?

[Butrus-Ghali] The difference is that the Rio-92 entails a complete program of action; a disagreement on the details of this program will not have any influence. When we refer to the Gulf War we allude to a very well-defined issue: an aggression between two countries. In Rio we discussed an entire process related to desertification, forests, technology, and the population explosion. We analyzed so many issues. There are a number of general programs, and many countries accept at least some of the ideas included in them.

[Salem] You are the first African to hold the post of UN secretary general. As a member of a Third World country, do you believe that rich countries will actually transfer technology and resources to poorer ones?

[Butrus-Ghali] I think so. They will be compelled to pay more attention to Third World countries. If they do not do so there will be a migration from the South to the North because such a Third World demographic explosion is expected in the next 20 years. Consequently, they should try to find a solution or share common projects.

[Salem] At this moment, where are the key points in international politics?

[Butrus-Ghali] Perhaps everywhere: El Salvador in Latin America, where we are promoting reconciliation; Yugoslavia, Armenia and Azerbaijan; Cambodia in Asia; and Angola, Mozambique, and Somalia in Africa. The end of the Cold War has helped to lift the threat of a World War III, but it paved the way for many other conflicts—national, ethnic, etc.

[Salem] Does any of them represent a major threat to mankind?

[Butrus-Ghali] They are all dangerous. We must handle all crises. We must be like a doctor, who does not merely take care of a patient requiring major surgery. We are taking care of both minor and major problems. The United Nations must intervene in all problems.

[Salem] Is it difficult to be UN secretary general in a world with so many wars?

[Butrus-Ghali] I have been in this post for just six months. I believe it is a great challenge. It requires hard work, political imagination, and physical endurance. You have to travel a lot, work a lot, and meet many people.

[Salem] When you were a candidate for this post, some people were opposed to your appointment because they believed you were too old for the duties of a secretary general...

[Butrus-Ghali] I have demonstrated that despite my age, I still have a sort dynamism. It is almost 2000 now. I started work at 0800 this morning. I have worked 12 hours already. I still have some meetings and I am still holding out. Right?

[Salem] During these six months, was there any political failure that hit you the hardest, that made you feel the burden of the post?

[Butrus-Ghali] I have failed to resolve many problems and have succeeded in resolving others. I have been involved in this type of work for 14 years. I am trained to deal with international crises, to work behind the scenes.

When people say: I have resolved this type of problem before, I say: Then deal with it again. When victory is achieved, many people always appear claiming it. When there is a failure, however, no one claims it.

[Salem] As the host country, has Brazil matched the importance of the Rio-92 conference?

[Butrus-Ghali] I want to thank the people and the government of Brazil for their warm welcome, for their contribution to the success of the conference.

[Salem] Did everything work out as you expected?

[Butrus-Ghali] Yes, yes. Look, you must not expect too much. Let us be realistic. When 170 countries get together it is not easy to find a common denominator. It takes time. A new spirit, which in my speech I called the Rio Spirit, was created. The fact that the conference took place, that it gathered more than 100 heads of state and heads of government, that, for example, the Chinese prime minister traveled 22 hours by plane to get here, and that they came from all over the world for two days just to be present and to contribute to the solution of the environmental issue is, no doubt, very important.

Castro "Believes" Bush's Presence Helped UNCED

PY1606032792 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 15 Jun 92 Ecology and City Section p 7—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Text] Yesterday President Fidel Castro said that despite disagreeing with George Bush's speech and with the fact that Bush did not sign the Biodiversity Treaty, he admits that the U.S. President is "a strong loyal adversary" because he attended Rio-92. The Cuban president believes that Bush's presence "helped with the conference's success." For Fidel, the great importance of Rio-92 does not lie in the agreements "but, essentially, in the consciousness created among world leaders and international public opinion on development and the environment."

The Cuban president attended a dinner at the Caesar Park Hotel hosted by [Rio de Janeiro] Governor Leonel Brizola and UN Secretary General Butrus Butrus- Ghali for Latin American and African heads of state. Fidel considers Rio-92 "a movement emerging with extraordinary force." Fidel is convinced that the conference was not useless.

Governor Leonel Brizola, whom Fidel called a friend, made it clear that the reports that he and the Cuban president disagree on are just machinations. Brizola recalled that Fidel had already visited his house on Atlantica Avenue. The origin of that alleged disagreement between them is that 28 years ago Brizola reportedly withheld $1 million sent by Cuba for the Serra do Caparao guerrillas.

Present at the dinner were Angolan President Jose Eduardo dos Santos, Bolivian President Jaime Paz Zamora, Cape Verde President Antonio Monteiro [Mascarenhas], Mozambican President Joaquim Chissano, Sao Tome and Principe President Miguel Trovoada, Guinea-Bissau President Joao Bernardo Vieira, and Uruguayan President Luis Alberto Lacalle.

"Even though President George Bush did not sign the Biodiversity Treaty, I believe the United States is not totally closed to this issue." This opinion was voiced by Governor Leonel Brizola yesterday during a visit he, along with Mexican President Carlos Salinas, made to the United Nations Ciac [Integrated Center for Assistance to Children]. In Brizola's opinion, the fact that President Bush said he was the U.S. President and not the world's president means that, therefore, he does not want to tackle projects that perhaps he cannot continue. President Carlos Salinas was laconic: "We signed."

Castro Talks About Environment, World Situation

PY1806005292 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 16 Jun 92 pp 12, 13—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with Cuban President Fidel Castro by JORNAL DO BRASIL reporters Luciana Villas-Boas and Regina Zappa at the Rio Palace Hotel in Rio de Janeiro on 15 June]

[Text] [JORNAL DO BRASIL] You have told JORNAL DO BRASIL that you considered Bush an honest adversary and that his presence at the UNCED was a positive fact.

[Castro] No. I did not say he was an honest adversary. I did not use that word. I did say that he made what I consider a positive gesture. I was somewhat impressed because I did not believe he would be there for my speech. He arrived a few minutes earlier and listened to my speech. I did not know at the time where he was exactly, but my comrades told me that he even applauded. I think this is appropriate at this kind of conference where it is a habit to applaud everybody even if one disagrees with them. I did not know whether Bush would be there to listen to my speech, or that he would make this, let us say, educated, gesture. I believe, however, that his presence, irrespective of our well-known positions, was a contribution to the conference because he could have not come. There had been a lot of talk on whether or not he would come. In this regard all those present at the conference, so many leaders, of so many countries, especially the major industrialized countries, made a contribution. Japan did not show up. I imagine they had a problem. It would have been good for Japan to be there. Japan's presence alongside the great powers would have been positive. All the issues were discussed at length before the conference and documents prepared in advance were signed at the summit. The conference worked very hard. Each one of the treaties signed had a difficult delivery. Endless meetings were held during those 10 days to prepare the documents. In the end they had them ready. All this took place in a very pleasant, very positive atmosphere. We all met for lunch and

everybody gathered under the same roof. There were no incidents whatsoever among the leaders, either out of courtesy or good manners.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Did you talk to Bush?

[Castro] No, no. We did not get together. Nowhere did they sit us side by side. There would have been a problem if we had decided to talk to each other, although I would have had no objections. I would have behaved in a completely dignified and decent manner.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Was Bush's isolation at the conference a display of strength or of weakness?

[Castro] I believe that the U.S. position elicited a unanimous reaction. The people disagree with the U.S. position. The people are dissatisfied with its attitude toward biodiversity. The United States was undoubtedly isolated. Practically all its allies signed the treaty. I believed that perhaps the United States would adopt a more flexible position, but it did not.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Do you believe that this was the first display of political independence by Europe and the other U.S. allies after the end of the Cold War?

[Castro] Well, it was a show of political independence. I do not know whether it was the first or the last. The positions were different; even among developed countries they had different shadings. Norway's position, for example, was a very good one. The position of (Canadian Premier) Mulroney was very weak and open. He is one of those who lends very weak support to the idea, the effort [to save the environment]. The positions of others were more cautious, with more reservations. The position of rich developed countries at this kind of conference is not an easy one, mainly because it is not easy to justify the enormous waste of resources and wealth in the light of the poverty prevailing in the developing world. Everybody remembers that colonialism gave birth to the large capitals and neocolonialism fed them. The foreign debt became the means to perpetuate backwardness and underdevelopment. Protectionism is an enormous obstacle for the development of Third World countries. Over the last 10 years unfair trade has cost the Third World $1.4 billion and the servicing of the foreign debt has cost $1.3 billion [figures as published]. Thus, the Third World lost almost $3 billion in the last 10 years. These are terrible obstacles for development. The Third World knows very well that it has financed capitalist overdevelopment during the colonial times, but also that it continues to finance this development under the neocolonial status. Therefore, this excessive luxury, and the squandering and waste of resources have been the cause of environmental problems. It is not easy to justify this. Those who are guilty of this squandering and waste cannot have a clear conscience. People are talking about developing countries, but in reality they are underdeveloped countries. I say this because the gap between developed and underdeveloped countries is growing. What we have are underdeveloped countries, countries that are falling behind. The gap is growing bigger and bigger. The more luxury and waste there is among consumer societies, the greater the poverty elsewhere. The international organizations have all the statistics.

Every year 14 million children die from curable diseases. These deaths could be avoided through proper health programs. It is as if a bomb were thrown at the children of the Third World every three days, a bomb like those of Horishima and Nagasaki, which killed more than 100,000 people. Whereas bombs leave radiation, the hunger and poverty that kill all these children also leave their aftereffects, such as malnutrition and poverty that do not allow the children that do not die to attain full physical and mental development. It is known that malnutrition causes a certain degree of mental retardation. I do not know about children, but it is known that many women die in the world because of epidemics: scores of millions every year, more than during World War II. We see this happening every day. We are horrified, and rightly so, by border conflicts. We are horrified when 10, 20, 30 people die. Meanwhile, 40,000 children die every day but no one talks about it. The Americans are the worst pollutors of the environment because they consume three-quarters of the energy they produce. They consume most of the metals and raw materials. There are also problems related to their lifestyle. Advertising turns this lifestyle into the aspiration of all Third World societies. It is, however, impossible to live like they do. Let us analyze. In the United States there are at least two cars in every house. There is at least one car per person, maybe more, I do not know. Now, let us just imagine what would happen if China implemented a development model aimed at giving each person a car, or if India's development model also sought to provide each person with a car. What would happen if Africa did the same? How long would the fuel last? How long would the air last? The air is already receiving 21 billion tons of carbon dioxide per year. Twenty-five percent of it comes from the United States. Almost all of it comes from developed countries. The consequences are disastrous for both soil and water and are causing a global catastrophe, the terrible heat, the tornados, the excessive rains and the droughts. The last 10 years have been the hottest of the century, and 1990 was the hottest of them all. All this has its agricultural, social, and economic consequences. The reduction of the ozone layer is very serious because this layer protects human beings from ultraviolet rays. The number of people with some kind of skin cancer in the United States is appalling. Both developed and developing countries are aware of this problem.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Can the environment issue bind the Third World together from now on?

[Castro] Objectively speaking, the environment and development should be a factor of unity. There lies the significance of this conference. People do not know if they will be alive tomorrow, or if they will eat the next day. Those who walk around barefoot, those who can die from a disease, those who go hungry, do not worry about the environment, but they do worry a great deal about

development. The combination of environment and development should be a binding factor for all countries because no one can escape from environmental degradation, and everybody knows this. It is also known that there must be development, that the world cannot go on like this, that the mess is getting worse all the time. A great many developed countries are aware that they have no options but to implement policies to help resolve underdevelopment. The two things go together. Now that the Cold War is over, what pretext can there be to continue spending millions and millions, enormous, almost incommensurable amounts on arms? In the last few years military spending has amounted to $13 trillion. These funds would have been enough to finance development, enough to implement life-compatible environmental policies. I believe that environment and development should together become an element of unity among nations. This is what happened here at the conference. It should not unite only the Third World, because alone the Third World will be unable to resolve the problem. The developed countries cannot resolve it either. We must all come together and work together as we have done at this conference. Finding a solution to these problems is extremely urgent. We are not dramatizing things; the problems are much more serious than people realize.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Do you believe in this union of Third and First Worlds?

[Castro] I believe that it is imperative for us to work together. Unless we do it, there will be no solution.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Can't the environment bring the Third World together?

[Castro] I believe that both environment and development are key issues. Developed countries are interested more in ecology than in the development of the Third World. It is possible that Third World countries are interested more in development. The two things, however, are very important and should go together. Separately the two issues will not unite, they will not instill a fighting spirit. The two issues are inseparable. This is something new for the Movement of Nonaligned Countries, whose members have many problems and for whom development and environment are vital. These issues could become the core of the nonaligned countries' struggle for independence and against the last traces of colonialism. When I talk about development, I talk about everything that influences it, such as foreign debt, protectionism, unfair trade, and technology transfers.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Has Cuba overcome the harshest part of the crisis, or are worse times ahead?

[Castro] We are in a full crisis, amid a very harsh and long crisis, but we are ready for any problem. For example, the situation could be worse with an increase in oil prices and a reduction in sugar prices, from which we earn the scarce currency with which to face the crisis. While we are creating new resources under very harsh circumstances, because we are suffering from a trade blockade, new adverse factors may turn up, so we must prepare ourselves well for that, and not raise short-term expectations. This is why our program is very important. Its merit is having carried it out under a very difficult economic situation. Until the present no country felt the economic blow that the disappearance of the socialist world represented for Cuba. We lost 60 percent of our imports. Cuba is currently receiving only 40 percent of the imports it used to receive, and less than 50 percent of the fuel it used to receive. This has also taught us to defend the environment, the ecology. We discovered the value of bicycles; why wasn't the value of this kind of transportation not appreciated before? Everybody used to ride on the bus to travel a few blocks, while it is much more healthy and clean to use a bicycle. The Chinese, out of wisdom and need, further developed the use of the bicycle. How many buses are necessary to replace all the bicycles? And how much fuel would they have to use?... We are facing a struggle without glory. But it will be better to consider that the blockade will be prolonged. This blockade is not only longlasting but is increasingly hardening. New things to hinder our development are created yearly; even our trade efforts, including our economic opening to foreign investments, which is an undeniable need—affecting the development of our country, the conditions in which it must develop. There is a meticulous and firm struggle against all of our country's activities. The blockade tends to become worse. We must prepare ourselves to resist an increasingly hardened blockade on Cuba.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] What can Cuba do to promote a political opening and at the same time combat the economic crisis?

[Castro] From the political point of view I think that we have a government system that is really superior to those in the rest of the world. The way we managed to implement it must be taken into consideration. We have a single party, but the party does not choose or postulate candidates. In Europe the parties are the ones that postulate and elect the parliament representatives. Based on a calculation of the amount of votes a party may obtain, it establishes lists of candidates and priorities. If a party knows it can elect three deputies, it places them first in line. The people vote for a party and the party is the one who chooses the candidate. In Cuba, the party does not postulate or elect candidates. The neighbors (citizens) are the ones who postulate candidates. It is the people who elect them. That is how we do it, but nobody knows about it. In the neighborhood meetings they propose several candidates to delegates for each voting district. After that, an election is held with not less than two and not more than eight candidates. Sometimes there are eight, seven, five, or only two candidates. The public is based mainly on their knowledge of the merits of the candidate. We do not have an election campaign with signs that pollute the city and make it dirty and which demand millionaire expenses, making it difficult for those who do not have money to have access to politics. In Cuba, our system is broad and free. It is even more healthy in the field of political ecology. The election system in Cuba used to be like a high school system.

The delegates of the voting districts elected the National Assembly which in turn elected the government. Now we have direct elections for deputies to the National Assembly and direct elections for delegates to the Provincial Assembly. We will try to preserve the purity of this political system in which 95 percent of the population participates without any obligation to vote. In the past, less than 50 percent of the voters participated in the elections in the United States.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Are new leaders being trained in Cuba? How will the island fare after Fidel?

[Castro] Possibly much better. There is a new generation that includes many more scientists, technicians, cadres, experience, knowledge, and culture. When the revolution began 30 percent of our country's population was illiterate. Today our workers have finished basic secondary school; there are hundreds of thousands of university graduates; there are 300,000 professors and teachers; and there are scores of thousands of scientists and engineers. Of the first contingent of revolutionaries, fewer and fewer are left all the time. There is a natural process of promoting young cadres in provinces and grassroots organizations. In Havana it is almost illegal to become old. Very soon we will have to create an organization to defend the political rights of the elderly because for the sake of promoting the young the few old people left are about to be pensioned off. Painters, doctors, scientists, artists—no one wants to retire, but politicians must retire. Doctors do not want to retire because they believe that the older they get the more they know, but it is not the same with politicians. If they replace us, however, we will not be ashamed. As humans we will not be ashamed. Our greatest satisfaction will be to see that our young people can do without us. We are not worried about the time when we will no longer be around. We do not have many years ahead of us. One would have to be very optimistic to believe otherwise. Political work is not conducive to a long life. Tensions, worries shorten the lifespan. We are not afraid, however.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Do you believe that the world is still moving toward socialism even after the demise of the Soviet Union?

[Castro] At this point the world is not moving toward socialism but toward neocapitalism, neoliberalism, the political trend in fashion. Let us see for how long, because this trend usually leads to enormous social crises in a very short time. Just because socialism has lost some ground does not mean that the socialist idea is dead. As a modern concept capitalism was born with the French Revolution. It burst into the world through the French Revolution, bringing new ideas and new institutions that opposed the feudal system. Great progress was attained, then capitalism lost ground. We should not forget that Restoration followed the French Revolution. Restoration, however, could not restore everything exactly as it was. But those concepts, those ideas, are still prevalent. A modern society does not achieve progress in a linear fashion. It may experience highs and lows, retrocession. Socialism is now experiencing a retrocession. But this does not mean that socialist ideals and objectives have been abolished. The reality of today's world has shown us that humanity must be more rational if it wants to survive—the peril of a nuclear war is gone but there is environmental contamination—by preserving the living conditions to which man has adapted millions of years ago and from which it has evolved. No one rejects the theory of evolution anymore. Even Darwin, who was so criticized and slandered, is accepted by all. Even the British prime minister mentioned Darwin in his speech. Everyone accepts the theory of the evolution of the species, of this species that has evolved into an intelligent being and which has yet to prove that it has evolved for the good of nature. What will happen if man—that species known as homosapien who has not yet sufficiently proven his wisdom—changes in one century the natural habitat which has taken him thousands of years to adapt and he is unable to adapt to these new conditions? Many phenomena dealing with the destruction of nature are beginning to occur—foods highly contaminated with chemical fertilizers that are harmful to health in the medium- and short-term; fish that are caught in high seas are often highly contaminated with mercury—a substance that is harmful to health—because of water pollution. Man's respiratory illnesses are constantly increasing because of the saturation of gasses. This is not caused only by the destruction of the ozone layer, which increases the possibilities of developing skin cancer, but by dozens of other phenomena. What will we do in 40 years—when the world population will reach 10 billion—in order to feed ourselves if we continue to destroy nature, erode our soil, and destroy our forests? We will not survive if we do not apply all the science that man has acquired to solve these future problems.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] How does the Cuban regime, which has always vindicated humanism and more humane social treatment, view the death penalty?

[Castro] The death penalty is not something to sympathize with. The death penalty is a resource to struggle against plans to destroy the country. We can advocate for the eradication of the death penalty as an ideal but we cannot do it unilaterally. We are willing to sign an international treaty by which all countries commit themselves to eradicate the death penalty. But if we make our rules more flexible, less strict, regarding certain perils we may be paving the way for our own destruction. You must understand that there are many people who believe that our revolution will be wiped out by the United States and this is why it is trying to enter Cuba to sabotage our economy and promote terrorism against the people. If these people believe that the maximum punishment they will receive will be spending some months in prison and later savor their treason, we will be unable to restrain them. Within this context, it is impossible to renounce capital punishment because it is a necessity imposed by the war situation we are experiencing. The death penalty exists in all countries at war. And Cuba cannot forget that the most powerful world power that

has ever existed in history is waging war against us and it is trying to destroy us. We are not living under normal conditions. Under normal circumstances, we may practice that superior humanism that advocates the eradication of the death penalty.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] You said that Cuba still practices internationalism, but the fact is that the economic crisis and the end of colonial wars have obstructed the exercise of internationalism. What ideological impact has this had on the Cuban people?

[Castro] At a given time we had to send combatants to different African countries. The most important case was that of Angola, which was attacked by South Africa. We had more than 50,000 men in Angola. We were forced to send this kind of assistance, and I am sorry we did because I would have rather sent doctors, teachers, and experts instead of soldiers. When the circumstances changed, peace was achieved. The South Africans withdrew, Namibian independence was recognized, there was great progress achieved regarding apartheid, and the reason for our presence there ceased to exist. We left. Under our present circumstances, we could not send this type of assistance. But we can still make important contributions in the fields of health, education, technical cooperation, and medical assistance. We have almost 100 doctors in Nicaragua. We do not have any military programs anymore, but we do have other programs. We have doctors in dozens of countries. There are scholarship programs for thousands of Third World youths. We have programs in Cuba for Chernobyl children. More than 10,000 children are being treated. No one speaks about these things, not even us. And even today after the demise of the USSR we are open to cooperation with three republics, mainly, Ukraine, Byelarus, and Russia. During the Rio de Janeiro conference, I could have discussed the blockade on Cuba and the unjust policies imposed on us. But we decided not to do this from this podium so as not to deviate from the main issue, so as not to divide the conference. I didn't even mention Cuba. I did not speak of its interests, or about its problems. I believe that this also constitutes an expression of solidarity, an expression of internationalist policy. We support the cause of those countries that want to achieve development and which we have been supporting for many years in a consistent manner.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] In Cuba we heard people say that the time has come for Cuba to think about itself and not about others.

[Castro] No, on the contrary. People are aware that the best service we can render others is to resist. People are aware that by defending our ideals, by defending Cuban independence, by defending our trenches, we are fulfilling a great internationalist duty. Internationalism also entails overcoming the current difficult situation we are experiencing. At a time in which the balance of power has ceased to exist, and in which our bipolar world has evolved into a unipolar world, with only one hegemonic power, we practice internationalism by defending the trenches of socialism, just ideas, and independence. This is what people are saying: The current task is to save the revolution, the fatherland, socialism.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] What was your most important thought the day that the Soviet flag was replaced by the Russian flag at the Kremlin?

[Castro] I believe that the entire world views with sadness, with ever-increasing sadness, the great tragedy that was the disintegration of the USSR. It shattered the world balance. Now the balance is tilted only to one side and, if people disliked bipolarity, they will like unipolarity much less, the prevalence of a single country above others. The prevalence of a country that is not characterized in its history by fraternal feelings, by loving other countries. Quite the contrary, it surged at the expense of its own indigenous population, of the territories of other countries, and it continued to expand like a great empire at the expense of the economic and political interests of the rest of the world. I would not like to confuse the country and the empire at this time because this country harbors many progressive people who are ecologically conscientious, who are aware of the poverty that others suffer. But the empire that the United States represents is quite powerful and this makes people restless all over the world. I can peceive this restlessness among its own powerful allies in view of the risk that this political and military power may be used against their own interests. Much more so now when there is a great economic struggle among the developed countries' groups: Japan, the United States, Europe.

It is sad to see a country like the Soviet Union disappear. But no one can deny this country's great influence in all aspects. The October Revolution had its influence on thinkers, politicians, writers. The USSR influenced the struggle for the liberation of peoples. It influenced the disappearance of the colonial system, even though it was later replaced by a neocolonial system. It helped influence the well-being of workers because the social revolution forced the bourgeoisie around the world to show concern for the working class which then tried to implement a fairer distribution of wealth and resources. All this is due to the October Revolution. This country paid for its fight against fascism with the lives of 20 million men and women because without this country's struggle, without its heroic struggle, fascism would have taken over the world. For some time, that is, because all empires last for only a certain period of time, they do not stay indefinitely. Hitler thought that his empire would last 1,000 years but it did not last even 10 years. No matter how much political, economic, or military pressure it can muster, even the United States will eventually discover that the world is ungovernable. The USSR was destroyed twice in 25 years but it was still able to industrialize, and this despite the blockade and isolation. The USSR had great industrial resources and a large territory, which is not the case for Cuba, a small country with scarce resources. The USSR was able to industrialize and reconstruct the country after World War II. It had great scientific successes even though it did not

always use its successes with the right criteria. The USSR was able to achieve nuclear parity in very difficult conditions and was able to confront the U.S. military power. The USSR was able to produce 600 million tonnes of oil per year, 300 billion cubic meters of gas, 150 million tonnes of steel, 140 million tonnes of cement, dozens of millions of tonnes of fertilizers, tens of thousands of kilometers of oil and gas pipelines, and a fantastic energy network in that very cold country. It did not make elegant shoes but it had great success in the production of basic raw materials. It was able to integrate the country that was born during a war, through conflicts. It is sad to see the country splitting with wars and bloodshed just when Europe is uniting politically and economically. The world is concerned about that, people are not happy to see the infighting. It is still uncertain how the situation will evolve but it is sad to see the scattering of qualified USSR scientists and technicians, the increase in unemployment—which will probably reach 15 to 20 million in one year. It is very, very sad. We must respect a country's right to hoist the kind of flag it wishes. It is understandable for me to feel sad when the Soviet Union's flag and symbols were taken down.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] Did you feel any fear during the Soviet disintegration process?

[Castro] Us? No, certainly not. We were very calm. We felt secure and had high morale. During dangerous times people produce more adrenaline. Our people produced a lot of adrenaline—political, revolutionary adrenaline when thinking of the difficulties ahead. It is surprising—and must be recognized by our enemies—that this small country stood alone defending its ideals when the socialist world disappeared.

[JORNAL DO BRASIL] What do you feel when you think that a tiny Caribbean island—against all political forecasts—is the bastion of socialism at the end of the 20th century?

[Castro] We did none of that. We were not looking for any type of glory. I think life has not been very kind to us. But we are the most independent country in the world. We do not depend on anyone. We only depend on the world as a whole. Life was difficult and subjected us to difficult tests. But I think that we still will "thank life"—as Violeta Chamorro's song says—for giving us so much. Because life gave us the difficulties but also the virtues to face them. I am sure that in the future when we remember this period we will be happy to have lived during this special period, because in times like this virtues flourish, people learn to work more efficiently. In times like this people learn things they could not learn before. I want to congratulate Brazil for the extraordinary success of the conference. Brazilian prestige was greatly enhanced by this conference, which will be considered a historic event; no one will dispute that.

Fidel Castro Issues 'Message' to UNCED

PA1506182092 Havana PRENSA LATINA in Spanish 0418 GMT 14 Jun 92—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

["Exclusive text" of message issued by Cuban President Fidel Castro Ruz to the UNCED, on 12 June in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; no dateline as received]

[Text] Messrs Heads of State or Government:

Each of us attending this UNCED is aware of the significance of this meeting and the urgency of reaching decisions that will allow effective measures to defend the very survival of mankind.

The accelerated and spiralling deterioration of the environment is today possibly the most serious long-term threat to mankind as a whole, and most especially to what is still called the Third World. In addition to the ever present danger of nuclear destruction, deterioration of the environment is the worst threat to all humanity. In underdeveloped countries it is one of the factors that most seriously worsens the living condition of millions of Third World people.

Never in the history of mankind has such a generalized and destructive aggression taken place against all of the world's vital systems. In the underdeveloped world, underdevelopment and poverty itself are the main factors that today have a multiplying effect on the pressure exerted on the environment. The over exploitation of arable or grazing land, improper agricultural practices, and the lack of financial and technical resources add to the harmful effect of adverse climates. In addition, the eagerness to obtain the greatest profit margin of natural resources and industrial capacities—in the case of capitalist exploitation, national or multinational, in or outside the Third World—adds its serious destructive quota and adds additional ways of contamination and degradation to the environment.

In the developed world, there are lifestyles that encourage irrational consumption and encourage waste and destruction of nonrenewable resources. These lifestyles multiply the tensions and effects to local and world physical environments at unprecedented and previously unimaginable levels.

For the first time in his history, man is capable of altering the equilibrium of the principal vital systems and breaking the natural laws that have governed evolution on the planet. Man can wipe out life if he unleashes nuclear war. Man actively affects, through genetic engineering, the accelerated mutation of species that required thousands of years to form in their natural state. For the first time man is capable of changing the course of life.

He is already doing so by acting directly on the environment. Every day the effects of the irrational race of man in his aggression against the environment are more evident. A short time ago for affluent societies these were faraway worries—worries that were detached from their

immediate concern. Today, however, these worries are not a distant threat but a common reality for all peoples.

This is why we are gathered in Rio de Janeiro. Awareness of the serious effects of the environment's deterioration has begun to spread. This deterioration is felt directly, immediately, and devastatingly by the world's most vulnerable and the poor and extends beyond the limits of the Third World to become a threat that affects all humanity. It is certain that if necessary actions are not taken, man is at the uncertain threshold that may mean the destruction of all forms of life.

Cuba, a small Third World country that struggles to develop under singularly adverse circumstances, can, notwithstanding, in its modest way, offer the world in general, particularly the underdeveloped world, the experience attained in conservation and environmental protection and the results obtained by our people in the various fields directly related to the topics that will be discussed at this meeting.

We state our recognition of the government of the friendly Republic of Brazil and its esteemed president, Fernando Collor de Mello, for the great responsibility of hosting the conference and our personal gratitude for his kind invitation to participate in the conference. I wish to state that Cuba participates in this meeting with the determination to contribute in the full measure of its capabilities and potential to achieve the goals for which we have gathered—fully convinced that all the efforts exerted toward the achievement of those goals represent a specific guarantee for our future.

Character and Urgency of a Modern Ecological Debate

The ecology issue has moved in the last two decades from the periphery to the very center of theoretical debate and the decisionmaking process in many parts of the world. The abundant literature on ecological issues that has recently proliferated frequently talks about the internationalization of the debate on ecology issues and the ecological movement, as a result of the evolution process that has gained prominence in recent years. The phenomenon that decidedly contributed to this awareness at world level is the emergence of an increasing number of nongovernment ecology organizations, some of which are characterized by their aggressiveness and the progressive range of their influence.

The consciousness-raising process is obviously based on the fact that the actual and potential effects of certain worldwide ecology problems worrying mankind have become much more evident in the last 20 years—including a depletion of the ozone layer, the warm climate resulting from the so-called greenhouse effect, acid rain, other forms of ecological damage caused by the more developed countries' consumer oriented and squandering model, the loss of our biodiversity, pollution caused by urban overcrowding, the international traffic of toxic waste, the pollution of underground and surface waters in our seas and coastal areas, the destruction of forests, and the depletion of agricultural lands.

These extremely critical problems include an element that should be given priority in our modern ecology debate—the awareness that man himself is the most endangered biological species, particularly in large areas of the world, where a majority of the population subsists in extremely precarious conditions.

Everyone knows this past decade has been the hottest in the last 100 years and it includes six of the seven hottest years in history. According to existing records, 1990 was the hottest year in history. This global warming phenomenon, a result of the so-called "greenhouse effect," entails important ecological, economic, and social consequences. According to certain estimates, given the lack of limitations on the current emission of gases that cause the greenhouse effect, the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will double between now and sometime in the 2025 to 2050 period, causing an increase of between 1.5 and 4.5 degrees Celsius in the world's average temperature. A direct effect of this phenomenon will be an increase of between 30 and 50 cm in the sea level by 2050, and approximately 1 meter in 2100, which would result in the flooding of many densely populated coastal areas. It would also affect many inland states. Other forecasts are much more worrisome and on a shorter term.

Weather changes would bring, among other things, changes in the rainy seasons and marine ecology. They would increase the probability of phenomenons such as hurricanes, tropical cyclones, and typhoons. Likewise, this would increase the temperate zones' vulnerability to tropical diseases such as malaria, dengue, and yellow fever; and many of the area crops, such as wheat, would be critically affected.

It is calculated the world's average ozone layer decreased approximately 5 percent in the 1979 to 1986 period. A hole in the ozone layer over Antarctica was discovered in the middle 1980's and, more recently, certain scientific reports indicate that conditions are ripe for the appearance of a similar hole over the Arctic Circle.

This deterioration of the ozone layer increases the vulnerability of living beings on the planet to noxious ultraviolet rays and, consequently, constitutes an enormous risk factor that is expressed in the increased likelihood of diseases such as skin cancer and many eye lesions, as well as considerable damage to cattle and certain crops.

The relative speed with which international negotiations have progressed, and the adoption of specific agreements to reduce and eventually eliminate the use and production of chlorofluorocarbons and gases that ravage the ozone layer, reveal not only the developed countries' concern over the deterioration of the stratospheric ozone, but the interest of important economic circles within those countries in leading the technological transformations that are suggested, and in controlling the transference of these technologies at an international level. It would be desirable to find a similar collective

resolve at this conference—for whatever reasons—that would allow us, with specific and effective actions, to deal with other environmental issues, which are just as worrisome and more urgent, such as the ozone layer problem.

During the period from 1860 to 1985, sulphuric anhydrite emissions, one of the leading causes of acid rain, increased from seven million tons to approximately 155 million tons annually. Very often acid rain is blown by the wind to other regions far from the area where the contamination is generated. This phenomenon has made life impossible in tens of thousands of rivers and lakes because it has altered the chemical composition of their waters, and has seriously damaged forests and crops, especially in Europe, North America, South America, China, and Africa.

There are other very important problems that contribute to deterioration, not of the atmosphere but of the planet's waters and lands. Many of these problems perhaps are not that new, but they have taken a high toll in terms of damage and lives, especially in underdeveloped countries. Poverty has been identified as one of the leading threats to positive environmental development because most poor people live in areas that are vulnerable from the ecological viewpoint: 80 percent of Latin America's poor; 60 percent of Asia's, and 50 percent of Africa's.

Water quality and the provision of potable water in underdeveloped nations creates dramatic situations. As a result of soil erosion, over 20 million hectares of farmland are lost throughout the world every year. At present, deserts are expanding at a rate of 6 million hectares annually. Approximately 3,500 million hectares of productive lands—a surface approximately equal to that of the American continent—are currently being affected by desertification, one-third of them severely, which is, according to the United Nations, a threat to the means of living of 850 million people. Recent figures from the FAO [UN Food and Agriculture Organization] indicate that the deforestation of tropical zones has increased from 11.3 million hectares annually in 1980 to 17 million in 1990.

The loss of biological diversity involving these processes is reason for deep concern. The contamination of oceans, seas, and coastal areas, as well as the dangers to which existing living resources are exposed in those areas, constitute another serious environmental problem.

Special attention should be paid to problems involving the international trafficking of toxic wastes, especially when the receivers are underdeveloped countries that lack the necessary means to adequately manage and dispose of these residues. Experience seems to prove that the solution of this issue should not depend solely on control methods aimed at making the shipment of such wastes so expensive that it would be more advantageous for industry to reduce the production of those substances.

If you examine the deterioration of the environment from a historical viewpoint you will see, generally speaking, that the greatest damage to the global ecosystem has been caused by the development patterns followed by the most industrialized countries. Meanwhile, the conditions of poverty in which the immense majority of the world's population lives also severely affects the environment and creates a distracting vicious circle between underdevelopment and poverty on one hand and environmental deterioration on the other.

Now, when the concept of sustained development has become commonplace, we must recognize that both the North's development pattern as well as the South's underdevelopment are environmentally untenable paths to economic development. However, it would be a mistake to view these two paths as having similar focal points, even though they are related, because it is absurd to demand the same degree of responsibility for the deterioration of the environment from a citizen with relatively high income, used to a consumer-oriented, developed country with wasteful ways, as from the poor inhabitant of any one of the more backward countries of the underdeveloped world. The poor man's daily concern is to find—with increasing difficulty—ways of preventing his children from starving.

The immediate environmental concerns of Third World countries differ from those of developed countries because very poor sections of the population in the underdeveloped world find it very difficult to plan the needs of future generations. Many of their daily basic needs are not even minimally satisfied.

In the more developed countries, where the common concern is the level of the quality of life, there is a growing concern about the medium and long-term effect of phenomenons such as ozone layer depletion and global warming. But ecological priorities must be different in underdeveloped countries, where infant mortality sometimes reaches 115 stillborn babies for each 1,000 born alive, where each year 14 million children die under the age of five, where more than 1 billion people have no access to the most elemental health service, where life expectancy is less than 63 years—52 years in poorer countries, where 300 million children are denied the right to schooling, where nearly 1 billion adults are illiterate, where more than 500 million people went hungry in 1990, and where 180 million children under the age of five suffer malnutrition.

In the Third World what is in danger first is not the quality of life, but life itself and the right to life. In environmental issues, the main concern in these countries has to be the availability of water, the lack of firewood, and the exhaustion of agricultural land.

What practical meaning can definitions such as ecosystems, biodiversity, environmental degradation, and ozone layer depletion have for the illiterate masses of the underdeveloped world? What possible attention can millions of human beings pay to these problems when hour

after hour, day after day, week after week, and year after year—all their lives—are spent in a desperate and anguished struggle to survive?

Obviously, if we truly want to eliminate the world's primary environmental problems, humankind must do two things. On the one hand, we must replace the consumer-oriented and wasteful culture of the industrialized world and high income sectors in developed countries. This culture must be exchanged for a way of life that, without sacrificing current material standards, will tend to a more rational use of resources and a significant reduction of aggression against the environment that today is nearly everywhere, because of that culture. We must encourage a radical change in the socioeconomic conditions of the Third World, and thus a change in the way of life of the enormous masses of impoverished people, through the transformation of current international, social, and economic systems—social and economic structures that in most of the underdeveloped countries favor the existence of these hungry, sick, dispossessed, and ignorant people.

Only then can we hope for a proper solution to the world's main ecological problems in the 21st century, which is on our doorstep. This requires, however, a general global awareness of the causes of these environmental problems, in all countries and at all levels in each country. From that point on, we could generate the required political resolve and the indispensable international aid to face it effectively.

Everything done in the meantime will be useful, and it should be encouraged and supported, but it certainly will not be the solution required and demanded by our own children, to whom we will bequeath an uninhabitable planet if we do not act soon.

The Vicious Circle of Underdevelopment and Ecological Deterioration

It has been proved repeatedly that the characteristics of environmental deterioration in Third World countries—given their underdeveloped state—have their own traits and origins, and have more critical results in those countries. The search for sustainable development in these countries is, above all, the search for development itself. Development entails not only growth, but also transformation of economic and social structures to improve living conditions and achieve a progressive formation of new ethical values.

It is precisely this development process that has been rejected in the South, not as a casual or occasional outcome, but inherent to a specific type of social relations and a way to organize production. Backwardness and poverty are possibly the least sustainable aspects of this development model.

The economic and social crisis that began in the 1980's has considerably contributed to the swift reproduction of factors that threaten the close and foreseeable future of the environment—by worsening the international economic order these countries embrace.

Third World economies still depend largely on the excessive exploitation of natural resources. In recent years the export of basic products, including fuel, has represented more than 45 percent of these countries' total exports, especially in Africa where they represent 90 percent.

These economies experienced a dramatic decapitalization process—both commercial and financial—in the last 10 years, thus precluding the possibility of sustained economic growth during a population explosion.

Consequently, the annual growth rate of the underdeveloped countries' gross national product has been decreasing for the last 2.8 percent in the period from 1983 to 1990. Something similar happened with the per capita income, which dropped from 3.3 percent between 1961 and 1970, and to 0.1 percent between 1980 and 1990.

Another phenomenon associated with the crisis, which has had very negative consequences on the ecology's deterioration, is undoubtedly the unequal distribution of income between the economies of the North and South, and even within the countries. Meanwhile, 20 percent of the population with the highest income in 1960 made 30 percent more than the poorest 20 percent; those levels were 60 percent higher by 1990. The richest groups currently represent between 10 and 15 percent of the population in underdeveloped countries, yet they control the largest part of the economic and natural resources. Ten percent of the population in Latin America controls 95 percent of its tillable land.

The main trade problems encountered by Third World countries are generally linked to the export of basic products, and they result from increasingly reduced access to developed countries' markets. This is caused by a more aggressive protectionist policy, and constant deterioration of prices and purchasing power, among other factors. Between 1980 and 1991, the average prices of 33 basic products exported by underdeveloped countries—excluding fuel—suffered a drop of 50 percent and, although their future behavior is difficult to predict, the World Bank has implied that they will remain at that level until 1995. In real terms, certain analysts have placed these products' current prices on a level with prices prevalent earlier in this century, while others have placed them on a level with prices prevalent around the middle of the 19th century.

A sample of 24 industrialized countries shows that 20 of them are currently more protectionist than they were 10 years ago. Their protectionism takes a toll on the underdeveloped countries. In terms of GDP [gross domestic product] sacrificed for exports that are not delivered, this represents a loss of $75 billion annually.

During the eighties, with the so-called foreign debt crisis, the flow of foreign financial resources was drastically

reduced; decades earlier, these resources had paid at least part of the most essential investments. The flow of resources in the shape of Official Development Assistance (ODA), especially, from the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries, is at present 50 percent lower than the proposed goal of 0.7 percent of these countries' GDP. The total ODA received by the underdeveloped countries in 1990 was scarcely $44 billion, while the foreign debt service—the foreign debt currently surpasses $1.3 trillion—over the past four years has averaged a little over $165 billion annually.

Thus, the underdeveloped countries' foreign debt service is equivalent every year to three times the total official foreign aid they receive. The final result is that, paradoxically, these countries have become net capital exporters, with figures ranging between $40 and $50 billion yearly over the past decade.

In 1990, the UNDP [UN Development Program] calculated that in the Third World there were approximately 1.2 billion people living below the poverty line. The economic and social situation in the South will tend to worsen to the extent that backwardness and recurrent economic crises increasingly decrease opportunities to revert, or at least halt, certain phenomena associated with the increase of poverty. One of these phenomena is uncontrollable demographic growth and the disproportionate process of urbanization in the Third World.

While the population growth rate in the industrialized countries averaged 0.8 percent annually between 1960 and 1990, in the underdeveloped countries it averaged 2.3 percent annually during the same period.

Between 1990 and the year 2000, the population growth rate in the underdeveloped countries will continue to be the highest: 2 percent compared to 0.5 percent in developed countries. It is believed that over 90 percent of world population growth during the next 10 years will take place in the underdeveloped countries.

Likewise, the rate of urbanization will continue to be more accelerated in the underdeveloped countries, as it will be influenced by a constant exodus from rural areas. Between 1960 and 1990 the Third World's urban population increased at an annual average rate of 4 percent, while in the developed countries urban populations increased by 1.4 percent.

For the period from 1990 to 2000, the urban growth rate in the underdeveloped countries is expected to remain the same, while in the developed countries it is expected to decrease to an annual average of 0.8 percent, according to UNDP estimates. Therefore, by the year 2000, of the 24 cities that will have more than 10 million inhabitants, 18 will be in underdeveloped countries, and of the six with over 15 million, four will be in underdeveloped countries also.

Do not forget that in conditions of underdevelopment, urbanization takes on a special connotation because of the lack of sufficient adequate infrastructure solutions. What really takes place is a process of disorderly growth of urban groups, primarily in the form of poor neighborhoods, with the consequent creation of large sources of environmental contamination and environmental degradation.

Under these conditions, it is much more urgent to face the serious challenge of ensuring an adequate level of nourishment for all the beings on earth, and to do so without causing further damage to our worldwide ecological surroundings. Effective worldwide political resolve is required to achieve this. Thus far, this has been impossible. Sixty percent of the current world population lives in countries that have low incomes and food deficits.

The poverty of the Third World is closely linked to the degradation of the environment.

With the exploitation of natural resources as the primary means of economic and social reproduction, and without the financial conditions and technology to adequately confront this issue, literally the only means of survival in these countries lies increasingly in the overexploitation of natural resources.

This relative wastage brings more poverty, by way of a shortage of available financial and technical resources to face the most adverse ecological conditions.

This creates a degrading vicious circle between the two phenomena. As the FAO has stated: "It is precisely those resources that are the source of life that are destroyed, not out of ignorance, but just to survive one more day."

The problems of underdevelopment, backwardness, natural disasters, and armed conflicts in the underdeveloped world, particularly during the decade of the 1980's, also contributed to a further deterioration of the environment. This is due to the large number of people who migrated from one country to another or from one area within a country to another, and the resultant overexploitation of the natural resources of a given region. This phenomenon is worsened, in most cases, due to the fact that nothing is done to protect the environment.

The most serious ecological problems created by this whole situation center mainly on the degradation of the soils, the creation of desert lands, flooding and drought, a deterioration in the quality and supply of drinking water, the loss of soil layers to erosion and deforestation, the loss of biological diversity, as well as the untapped growth of urban concentrations, among others. The present situation of these negative processes is much worse than that registered at the 1972 conference on the urban environment.

At present, close to 1.3 billion people—almost 30 percent of the Third World population—have no access to sources of drinking water, and over 2.2 billion have no sanitary services. This is relatively worse in rural areas. In 1990, only 63 percent of the rural population in this

group of countries had drinking water, versus 82 percent of the urban population. Only 49 percent of the rural inhabitants had adequate sanitary services, versus 72 percent of urban inhabitants.

Meanwhile, the number of human beings continues to grow whose food supply hypothetically depends upon a fraction of an acre of farming land. This is the result of the increasing population and the continuous degradation of the soil.

The lack of financial and technical resources is well known. These resources would allow Third World farmers to increase the productivity of their work and the yield of their land, in order to maintain adequate production levels on the already existing areas of agricultural exploitation. Based on this, it is understandable that the only short-term solution for these farmers is to incorporate new extensions of land for their primitive farming methods, which is the direct cause of some of the worst forms of environmental deterioration. To this we must add the displacement of the individual farmer from the more productive lands in certain regions, by extending land tenure practices, or inversely, the continued subdivision of the land into ever smaller and unproductive plots. So closes another vicious circle, from which there seems to be no escape for the impoverished farmer of the underdeveloped world.

To act in favor of the conservation and improvement of the environment, then, unavoidably means to act against the causes that foster the degrading poverty displayed by the Third World as it approaches the 21st century. Without a doubt, this will require a series of social and economic changes, both on a national and international level. Such changes could begin with a just and lasting solution to the issue of foreign debt in the underdeveloped nations and with the redirection of available financial and monetary resources to those development plans.

On this same line, it is quite elementary to say that the world's expenditure on weapons is still excessively high, particularly as we witness the fall of socialism in Eastern Europe and the disappearance of the Soviet Union—which for many means the end of the Cold War and the establishment of a single-poled world from a political and military standpoint. Although they have dropped slightly, expenditures surpass $800 billion a year. Underdeveloped countries account for over $120 billion a year. It is essential to do away with the absurd contrast between the mass of resources used for means to exterminate man and nature, and the need to direct such resources to the development and conservation of human life and nature.

Analyzed in its environmental scope, interdependence between the backward and poor underdeveloped world of the South and the industrialized world of the North grows more pronounced because they exist in one planet. The underdeveloped countries have also taken on the battle for the ecological protection of the Earth. The strategy of this war, however, cannot entail separating the problems of the environment and the problems of economic and social development.

Quite to the contrary, if we want to guarantee a future ecological security, we must endeavor to keep the indiscriminate exploitation of the environment from becoming pronounced. This exploitation is happening now, due to the indifference toward the right of development of three-fourths of mankind. Indifference must be replaced by the recognition of the different degrees of responsibility regarding this phenomenon and by the establishment of fair and preferential treatment so that the underdeveloped countries can have access to the appropriate resources and technologies to this end.

The Ecological Debt of Developed Countries

The underdeveloped countries have insisted on the need for an overall approach to the search for solutions to the problems of the environment and development and have supported a restructuring of international economic relations that would allow those countries to have access to financial resources and required technologies to undertake sustainable development programs. From that perspective, the starting point of any negotiation on the environment and development must be the recognition of the ecological debt the industrialized nations have contracted.

Nobody can deny in good faith that the foremost factor in the deterioration of the global environment is the model of economic behavior the more developed societies created and extended to the rest of the world on the foundations of their own power and the influence of their instruments to shape public opinion. A lifestyle based on an irrational zeal for consumption and an absurd squandering of resources constitutes the chief enemy of the environment nowadays.

The member countries of the OECD represent barely 16 percent of the world population and 24 percent of the total world surface. Their economies contribute 72 percent of the global GNP and generate approximately 76 percent of the total world commerce, including 73 percent of exports of chemical products and almost the same percentage of imports of timber products. The OECD countries are also responsible for 45 percent of the world's emission of carbon dioxide, 40 percent of the sulfur dioxide emissions, and 50 percent of the nitrogen oxide emissions. They produce 60 percent of the world's industrial waste and generate 90 percent of toxic waste. In 1984, the United States, the EEC, and Japan produced 86 percent of the world's chlorofluorocarbons, whereas the Third World countries produced only 4.4 percent.

The OECD countries use 52 percent of the total commercial energy, including 50 percent of fossil fuels and 56 percent of oil consumed in the world. Of the 10 countries that generate the most gas emissions that cause the greenhouse effect, five are highly industrialized. If we incorporate the former Soviet Union among them, the figure would exceed 40 percent the total emissions. The

United States alone, which spews the largest amount of gases, is responsible for 17.6 percent of the world total. The contribution of the developed countries to the greenhouse effect is four times as large as the Third World's.

From an historical standpoint, the developed countries have been the chief promoters and beneficiaries of deforestation in the developed countries [as received]. It was due to the colonial regime, and later to the economic expansion of the major capitalist powers and the neocolonial exploitation of the natural resources of the Third World, that the indiscriminate felling of forests in vast areas of the world and the exploitation of timber took place. It turned these forest areas into agricultural land destined to be used for the production of food and raw materials to be exported to those industrialized countries.

If the phenomenon is analyzed from a broader prospective, the inevitable conclusion is that the ultimate responsibility for the accumulated deterioration of the environment in the Third World as a whole falls on the developed capitalist world, particularly those countries which, through colonialist and neocolonialist exploitations, have been historically to blame for the backwardness and distorted economies of the African, Asian, and Latin American countries, which in turn have been and continue to be the final cause of the most generalized and acute environmental problems of the Third World.

The primary producers of pesticides, fertilizers, and other harmful chemical products continue to be the developed nations, even since the use of these products has been prohibited. In many cases, these nations are direct suppliers to other nations or have transferred their technology.

Although the industrialized nations are not the only ones involved in direct and indirect activities associated with warfare and all related matters leading to the outbreak of war, they do have a large amount of responsibility in the worldwide generation of the waste of large volumes of resources involved in these activities, as well as the consequent environmental deterioration and alteration in the ecosystems in many regions of the planet. During the Vietnam War alone, over 80,000 metric tons of defoliant called "Agent Orange" were dropped over that nation, triggering disastrous consequences for the human physical environment and for health. Radioactive contamination derived from nuclear explosions and accidents is also associated mainly with the industrialized nations. It has been estimated that 20 percent of the most developed nations' industrial contamination comes from factories linked to military hardware production. The prospecting and extraction of large volumes of the majority of the metals demanded for military activities have a much higher level of impact upon the environment than other mining activities.

Too often in the developed capitalist societies the incompatibility between the ecology, on the one hand, and the principle of profit on the other is all too evident. There is an immeasurable desire for consumer goods and a principle goal of individual well-being that are the essential engines of these societies.

The technological advances for the preservation of the environment in the transportation sector, for example, have been invalidated by that sector's uncontrolled growth. This is very true of automobiles because 78 percent of the automobiles circulate in the industrialized nations.

One of the deficiencies of the environmental control policies in many developed nations has to do with their retroactive application and the scope of some regulations. There are still approximately 100,000 chemical compounds that are used commercially in these nations with risky side effects, and they are not prohibited because they were in use before certain measures were established. Although the use of another group of chemical compounds has been prohibited in these nations, they do allow these compounds to be exported to other world regions.

Environmental protection policies have been incorporated into the foreign economic policies of some industrialized nations in such a way that they have had a significant impact on some of the underdeveloped economies. For example, since the middle of the last decade, there has been a marked tendency to condition economic aid to developing nations based upon an alleged criteria of shared responsibility by both nations in the environmental area. Strictly speaking, this aid should be supplied based on the acknowledgement by the developed nations of their historical responsibility for the economic development and the environment's deterioration in the Third World and should not be regarded a matter to be linked to goals that are never achieved.

Historically, the developed nations have contributed to the export of contamination to the Third World since the decade of the sixties. This system has been used to transfer the ecological costs derived from the use of certain technologies. This process comes about in a direct manner, through the export of industrial wastes or other harmful substances or, in an indirect manner, through the transfer of contaminating technology and the export or imposition on the underdeveloped nations of consumption patterns and the application of wasteful economic practices.

The sending of toxic waste to the Third World represents one of the sources of contamination exported directly from the North to the South. Because of the difficult situation of the underdeveloped economies, the opportunity is used many times to offer them foreign currency or other scarce resources in exchange for taking toxic waste that, in most cases, is not properly processed in the receiving countries. In other cases, acid rain, caused basically by the emissions of industrial pollutants in the developed countries, is transported by the wind and falls very far from its place of origin, thereby affecting many developing countries.

The multinational corporations are largely responsible for the process of transferring contaminating technologies to underdeveloped countries, particularly since the 1960's. The environmental regulations in these countries, which favor the import of contaminating technologies, many times turn out to be sloppy because of the need to receive investment and technological resources. The actual development models adopted or imposed on the South in the last three decades are similar. In the underdeveloped countries, the multinational corporations participate actively in very sensitive environmental sectors, such as mining, petroleum extraction, industry, the preparation of chemical products, refining heavy metals, and manufacturing automobiles, among others.

Basically, the ecological deterioration of the North has been largely "exported" to the South, as part of the large process of capitalist development. It is precisely the weak underdeveloped economies, where the noxious effects of their decay are combined with the high levels of poverty and economic dependence, that has led to the socioeconomic vulnerability of these nations. It is now up to the developed and rich world to cancel its ecological debt with the underdeveloped and poor part of mankind through cooperation, financial, and technical assistance, and through the transfer of clean environmental technologies. Doing this would only be an act of historical justice and, ultimately, a show of good sense and a contribution to the actual welfare and subsequent development of the South.

Global Warming, Underdevelopment, and the Energy Crisis

According to some estimates, 49 percent of the gases that cause the greenhouse effect come from the energy sector, 24 percent from industry, 14 percent from deforestation, and 13 percent from agriculture. Currently, mankind consumes 161 million units equivalent to one barrel of petroleum daily, as compared to global consumption of approximately 8 million units 150 years ago. It is estimated that by the year 2010, energy demand will increase between 50 and 60 percent.

As is known, the predominant use of fossil fuels—coal, petroleum, and natural gas—in the consumption of energy results in this sector being responsible for half of the greenhouse effect. Fossil fuels together represent more than 90 percent of the world's balance of commercial energy. In the case of carbon dioxide, considered as the main generator of the greenhouse effect, the energy sector alone releases approximately 21 billion tons of gas each year. Seventy percent of this emission is associated with the use of fossil fuels.

Consequently, the measures to control weather changes are basically aimed at modifying the current patterns of production and the consumption of energy.

At the international level, the industrialized countries are the main countries responsible for global warming. They have based their development, to a large extent, on an intensive consumption of fossil fuels. Conservative estimates indicate that highly industrialized countries, with only 15 percent of the world's population, absorb 50 percent of the world's consumption of fossil fuels, and they contribute more than 50 percent of the world emissions of gases that cause the greenhouse effect.

Meanwhile, underdeveloped countries, where three quarters of the world's population live, absorb less than 18 percent of the global consumption of fossil fuels. The per capita relationship of fossil fuels consumption between highly industrialized and underdeveloped countries is eight to one.

According to the experts, the underdeveloped nations' main contribution to global warming comes about by the emission of carbon dioxide in association with deforestation. This process is triggered, in part, by the inefficient and irrational utilization of the traditional biomass fuels such as firewood. In many Third World nations, approximately 70 percent of the population uses firewood for energy. It is estimated that by the year 2000, approximately 2.4 billion persons will live in areas where there will be a serious shortage of firewood.

When the time comes to establish responsibilities with regard to global warming, it is not possible to equate the effects of tropical deforestation and the emission of methane gases derived from certain plantations in underdeveloped nations with the emissions of contaminating gases from other sources in developed nations. In all fairness, there must be differential treatment because the two are phenomena of quite a different nature. While the majority of the emissions of Third World countries are caused by their state of underdevelopment and poverty, emissions from the industrial North have been the result—to a great extent—of the excessive and wasteful use of energy.

The energy conservation programs in the Third World have been very limited due, to a great extent, to the severe financial and technological restrictions that these nations face. In 1989, the consumption of petroleum per unit of the gross national product in that group of nations surpassed by almost 65 percent the level corresponding to the developed nations. The energy crisis that those nations face is translated in the following ways: in the low levels of per capita consumption of commercial energy; in the lack of modern and diversified networks; in the lack of development of new and renewable resources; in the limitations to assimilate state-of-the-art technologies such as nuclear energy, among other problems. Faced with these realities, the majority of the Third World's population has no other alternative than to deplete the environment just to survive. In this way, for example, an African household uses five times more energy for cooking than a European family.

Some writers have demonstrated that the underdeveloped nations could have reached the standard of living similar to what Western Europe had in the decade of the 1970's, without the need to substantially increase the

consumption of energy per capita. This scenario presupposes the use of more efficient energy technologies, the investment of large financial resources to substitute for the current structure of energy consumption based, in the majority of cases, on the irrational use of traditional biomass fuels, such as firewood and animal and vegetable wastes.

In view of the above, the energy sector should have top priority when evaluating the Third World's financial and technological needs, in order to break the existing vicious circle between the energy crisis, technological underdevelopment, and the deterioration of the environment in general. In the framework of the international negotiations regarding changes in climate, the underdeveloped nations have spoken in favor of creating a global system to transfer financial resources and suitable environmental technologies that would allow these nations to reduce the emission of gases contributing to the greenhouse effect and, at the same time, to establish the basis for a process of sustained economic development.

In this context, the levels of gas emissions from the greenhouse effect, so unequal between developed and underdeveloped nations, should also be a starting point in the negotiations. These should also be analyzed from a historical perspective that would allow us to recognize the accumulated effect of the environment's deterioration caused by the emissions of the industrialized nations. Likewise, the principle that each of the planet's inhabitants has equal access to the atmosphere should be observed and, therefore, the establishment of emission quotas should be based, in any case, on a per capita distribution.

Among the multiple initiatives presented to limit the emission of gases due to the greenhouse effect, the two proposals that have generated greater debate are those that refer to the establishment of a tax on the consumption of the diverse sources of energy, in terms of the amount of carbon dioxide each releases, and emission permits that could be marketed at the international level according to the laws of the market.

Some studies coincide in stating that the application of taxes on carbon dioxide emissions would translate into higher internal energy prices in the developed countries, with the ensuing slowdown in the growth of these economies. Consequently, a contraction of the largest foreign markets of the underdeveloped countries would take place, which would put additional financial pressure on those nations. It could increase imported inflation, raise international interest rates, and reduce the world flow of credits. Some estimates indicate that for each percentage point reduction of commercial activity in OECD countries, the rate of economic growth of underdeveloped countries would shrink by 0.7 percentage points. This reveals the high degree of subordination and dependence of the underdeveloped economies with respect to the industrialized North.

According to a study conducted by the Secretariat of OPEC, the gross domestic product of underdeveloped countries would register accumulated losses of between $600 million and $3.7 billion for the period 1991-2010, as a result of the forceful policies on carbon dioxide implemented by the OECD. A considerable portion of such losses would correspond to the countries that export energy, which would see their foreign currency revenues decrease considerably. In the underdeveloped non-OPEC member countries, the average rate of annual growth of the gross domestic product for the period 1991-2010 would suffer a contraction of between 0.1 and 0.8 percentage points. These countries, which are mostly net importers of energy, would certainly become less dependent if international petroleum prices were reduced, which could result from the implementation of taxes on carbon dioxide in the OECD countries.

In the event that the implementation of these policies in the OECD became generalized, the developed countries should assume the responsibility for compensating developing countries for the losses incurred because of this measure. Some studies funded by the United Nations suggest that a part of the funds received by way of these tax policies be devoted to the Third World in order to finance sustainable development. Otherwise, underdeveloped countries would be the ones to assume a large part of the cost of the adjustment that, undoubtedly, must be implemented by developed countries to alleviate the deterioration of the environment.

In addition, there is the potential danger that a relocation or displacement of the activities that release carbon dioxide within the OECD countries would occur towards other regions of the world, where taxes are either lower or nonexistent. This would reinforce the trend of transferring contaminating technologies to the Third World and, as a result, the effect of the aforementioned forceful policies on the global emissions of carbon dioxide. Because of this, these forceful policies must be accompanied by regulations for the activity of multinational companies outside of their country of origin, so as to force these companies to assume commitments toward sustainable development.

Meanwhile, the negotiable emission permits represent a market mechanism that, according to its promoters, is the most effective way to control the emissions of carbon dioxide and, at the same time, to secure the financial resources needed by underdeveloped countries. These resources are needed to face the problems of underdevelopment and the deterioration of the environment. The defenders of this mechanism claim that by granting emission permits to each country based on per capita quotas, most underdeveloped countries would receive permits well above their level of emission in the short term. These permits could, therefore, be sold to industrialized countries that have exceeded their quotas. This will permit underdeveloped countries to receive large amounts of financial resources, which could then be used to finance programs and technological policies aimed at adjusting the level of emissions to a lower level. In

addition, developed countries would be stimulated to increase energy efficiency and transfer more effective energy technologies to the nations of the Third World.

However, an enormous danger for developing countries lies behind the apparent goodness of this proposal. Given the severe financial restrictions that underdeveloped nations are facing and the important decision-making power of developed countries, large numbers of the emission permits of underdeveloped countries could be liquidated at sale prices, and substantial portions of the revenues from such sales could be taken up by servicing the debt or covering other financial deficits, without having any significant impact on the development of safe environmental technologies.

Even those who would promote exchanging debts for emission permits are sure to appear; a practice which undoubtedly will have serious implications for the Third World.

It is no coincidence that there is an intention to use market mechanisms as the main solution to environmental problems, as part of the wave of neoliberalism currently circling the globe. Under such a system of commercialization of emission permits—contamination permits would be a more fitting name—the socioeconomic activity of the underdeveloped countries could be seriously limited, as permits are sold without making the necessary adjustments to improve energy efficiency, specifically speaking, and the economy, generally speaking. Within the framework of the emerging new world order, this could be one of the possible ways of handling the theory of sustainable development, which would benefit the interests of the developed countries and reinforce the underdeveloped South's relationship of subordination and dependence with the industrialized North.

Biodiversity and Development

Mankind has constantly been affecting the natural habitat of living species—including his own—in his adaptation process, as he sought food, shelter, energy, and clothing, among other things. As a result of man's actions, the resulting disappearance of plant, animal, and microscopic species has accelerated to an ever greater rate. The rate of disappearance was calculated at one per day in 1980 and at one per hour in 1990.

In general terms, it is estimated that approximately 250,000 species—one quarter of the earth's total biodiversity—are in danger of extinction within the next 20 to 30 years. Some specialists suggest that some 350 bird species, 200 mammals, and about 25,000 plant species are on the verge of disappearing. The loss of these world-wide genetic resources constitutes the most serious and irreversible consequences of deforestation and, in general, of the deterioration of the physical existence of the globe.

This problem is related to the phenomenon of underdevelopment, as perhaps no other problem of the many that make up the so-called ecological crisis. Underdeveloped countries, because of the geographical area they occupy, possess the most important natural riches and the widest variety of biological reserves. They also develop under socioeconomic conditions that promote the over exploitation of such resources. In the tropical rain forests, for example, which could contain up to 90 percent of the world's biological diversity, the extinction rate and the alteration of their habitat has increased, mostly as a result of deforestation.

Other habitats rich in species, which are also in danger of extinction, are the coral reefs, geologically old lakes, and swamps and marshlands. The coral reefs, in particular, extending over 400,000 square km of the earth's surface and sheltering an estimated 500,000 species, are suffering the effects of the gradual warming, ocean pollution, and human predation. The rate of deterioration threatens to leave just a small and devastated reminder by the beginning of the next century. This would mean an enormous loss of living organisms and toxins that are of great medical importance.

The biodiversity loss can also be seen in the deterioration of the genetic diversity of each species—a phenomenon that suggests a progressive loss and possible disappearance of certain varieties within a specific species or breed. It seems quite contradictory to observe how science and technology are allowed to explore and exploit the widest genetic variety of animal and vegetable species, while that same genetic variety is in such danger. Furthermore, the relatively faster reduction or disappearance of certain species which we know little or nothing about, is very disquieting. Scientists have carried out extensive studies on one out of every 100 vegetable species and on even less of the animal species. At the current rate, an unforeseeable number of species will be extinct before even being discovered by man, much less making use of their unknown potential. This will have serious ecological and economic consequences.

Socioeconomic, and, in particular, technological factors have influenced this process. It is now recognized that as a result of the so-called green revolution, agriculture was turned into a process that is heavily dependent on chemicals, which had a severe impact in the environment. It also promoted a deterioration of genetic diversity because the harvests of high-yield hybrids was preferred.

In this same respect, voices are increasingly being heard regarding the positive and negative implications that the accelerated biotechnical development of recent years may have in the foreseeable future, especially in its applications on the food industry. Progress in the techniques of genetic manipulations make it possible to foresee, and in fact some of it has already been achieved, an improvement of plants and animals—in terms of their adaptation to the environment, as well as in their productive possibilities, the incorporation of now barren land to production, and even the production of food from unnatural raw materials, among many other uses.

To be sure, all of this establishes the need to preserve that diversity as the sole means of guaranteeing the biological source of genetic engineering.

Now more than ever, the underdeveloped countries are in urgent need of knowledge and scientific and technical development. This development would provide the solutions to many economic, social, and ecological problems, because, in the current phase of capitalist development, scientific knowledge plays a central role in the accumulation of capital. Modern biotechnology could constitute a path for economic development and the fulfillment of many food, energy, and health needs of South countries, which possess ecosystems with the greatest biodiversity and the majority of the so-called centers of phytogenetic diversity.

Based on the possibilities stemming from the development of modern biotechnology, the genetic resources of the underdeveloped world have acquired an extraordinary value. This takes place within a context of the great dependence on foreign technology of those countries, which also have very precarious systems to guard against the commercial appropriation of the genetic material they own.

The essential characteristics of the current biotechnological development do not seem to point toward net gains by the underdeveloped countries, which would be the producers in greatest need of this new technology. Just as it happened with the green revolution, the poor Third World producers will not have access in general terms to those breakthroughs, nor will their dependence on foreign products be reduced. What is more, with the process to save and replace raw materials that the biotechnological—and, in general, technological—progress is making possible in the industrialized nations, the major Third World exports are receiving a serious blow.

In fact, the control and mastery over genetic resources constitutes a new form of looting of the Third World and becomes a chief objective of transnational companies in this field. The monopoly that those major companies exert over advanced biotechnological research means that work is not done on what is more necessary, but on what offers the greatest commercial possibilities. The example of seeds is sufficiently eloquent. The expansion by the major transnational chemical and pharmaceutical companies toward the seed sector places the Third World producers in a position of greater subordination and dependence, as they are now the buyers of a more expensive technological package based on the interests of these companies rather than on the economic and ecological interests of the agricultural production of the underdeveloped countries.

The private nature of advanced biotechnological research in the developed countries causes this activity to be conducted under conditions of increasing secrecy, as the chief objective is to produce a new product that can be patented and, with it, obtain technological profits. That situation constitutes a major obstacle for the transfer of technology to the underdeveloped countries. In addition, it prevents these countries from having access to higher academic centers so they can train their scientific cadres.

The boom of the privatization process, joined with the supreme interest of maximizing profits, have a growing impact over the new mechanisms of control of intellectual property rights on biotechnological progress and, even, of control over the national patrimony of the underdeveloped countries.

They are trying to impose a patent system on underdeveloped countries, which, in the first place, disavows the right of participation of these countries in the final benefits. These countries contribute the life source for new discoveries and, for hundreds of years, have contributed to their improvement and natural selection, making an important contribution. Second, underdeveloped countries would be even less capable, particularly financially, of access to such advancements. But the most serious thing is that the extension of market mechanisms to problems related to the conservation of biodiversity could be paving the way for the loss of national sovereignty over natural resources.

The proposals for the conservation of biodiversity are related to the concerns over the loss or the erosion of it. All specialists agree on the superiority of conservation of the ecosystems and the species in their natural surroundings, but generally speaking, underdeveloped countries lack financial resources for this. The conservation of germ plasm [germoplasma] takes place in more than 450 institutions around the world: Fifty percent of these collections are located in industrialized countries, 21 percent in the banks of germ plasm of international centers, and 29 percent in developing countries.

Currently, a great deal of pressure is being exerted favoring the privatization of the collections of international centers of agricultural research that, like those related to the FAO and UNESCO, have so far permitted free access to their genetic resources. The World Bank has recommended that these centers establish financial agreements and implement patents and other forms of rights of property. Different initiatives by the FAO aimed at protecting free access to the phytogenetic resources have interfered with the interests of multinational corporations and the industrialized countries.

All of the aforementioned are the reasons why negotiations on a convention on biodiversity, as part of the preparatory process of this summit in Rio, has caused particular concern among underdeveloped countries.

Everything seems to indicate that the developed countries, especially the United States, seek to achieve a convention that will guarantee them free access to and a greater control over the national and sovereign resources of the underdeveloped countries, without recognizing those countries' rights as owners of the biological and genetic resources that are a source of knowledge and scientific and technological development. At the same

time, highly industrialized countries are trying to establish at the Uruguay Round stricter control over the rights of intellectual property, including biotechnological advancements.

It must be insisted that in any convention on biodiversity that favors in a preferred manner the interests of industrialized countries, as well as any alternative attempt on the part of the United States to impose declarations of principle on this matter, would not only represent a threat to the sovereignty of the underdeveloped countries, but would also constitute legal instruments that might serve to reinforce the conditions imposed on economic aid to the Third World. Indeed, if any modification to living organisms can be patented and can result in profits, how will the underdeveloped countries be compensated for their contribution to the genetic diversity that serves and will serve as a basis for obtaining what has been modified? How will the Third World be able to protect its natural resources and, especially, its biological diversity so that it can serve its very development?

Financial Resources and Technology Transfer

According to preliminary estimates, all underdeveloped countries would require no less than $40 billion extra per year to invest in programs aimed at achieving environment sustainability, based on 1990 level of economic activity. This amount represents 25 percent of the total payments made by these countries to service their foreign debt during that year. In 2000, the necessary amount would total approximately $60 billion.

Some ecological organizations have stated that the implementation of Agenda 21 requires approximately $125 billion annually in assistance for the Third World until the end of the century, without considering the contribution that will have to be made by those very underdeveloped countries. Other estimates indicate that if the needs of the Third World to protect the environment are added to the needs for socially needed growth, the amount of additional capital required would total approximately $60 billion in 1990 and close to $140 billion in 2000.

Considering the large amount of resources that are needed and the serious financial restrictions the underdeveloped countries are facing, making substantial investments for environmental goals would chiefly depend on an overall, just, and lasting solution to the serious problems these economies are facing. These problems include the huge foreign debt, the transference of resources abroad—which is linked to the foreign debt problem—trade barriers that restrict access to world markets under conditions of equality, and existing limitations to technology transfer to the Third World. Nobody is denying the need for underdeveloped countries to work in designing their own strategies for socioeconomic development to ensure the sustained expansion of their productive capacity, cope with serious social problems, correct environmental problems of the past, and avoid a subsequent deterioration of the environment based on the available resources. It is evident, however, that foreign financing plays a major role. This is the first way to pay the ecological debt of the developed world.

Foreign financing for sustainable development cannot be the result of a redistribution of the already scarce financial resources that reach the underdeveloped countries, but a flow of new capital. Otherwise, the topic of the environment would only constitute a new condition imposed on the foreign aid. The additional flow of capital, in addition, must be granted under favorable payment conditions, in terms of interest, as well as in terms of payback periods, including the possible allocation of a considerable volume of nonreimbursable loans.

According to some estimates, to cover the pledged amounts of Official Aid for Development and the additional financial resources required by the underdeveloped countries for environmental purposes, the developed countries should earmark no less than 1 percent of their GNP every year to the underdeveloped nations as "official aid for sustainable development." That would mean the developed countries should earmark an additional contribution of at least .3 percent of their GNP to the Third World's environmental programs. These estimates exclude the financial flow to the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe.

The fact is, however, that, in general terms, although there have been a few exceptions, the developed countries have been reluctant to acquire commitments regarding additional financing for sustainable development.

On the matter of the discussions on the need for additional flows of resources for environmental purposes, we often hear the concept of "association for additions", which means the need to formulate the policies and strategies of the developing countries among each other as a precondition to stimulate the flow of financial resources earmarked for environmental purposes. Every attempt directed at attaining a greater coordination of economic policies among the underdeveloped countries no doubt tends to make their economies more complementary, chiefly within the framework of systems of economic integration. If, however, the idea under the heading of "association for additions" is to expand neoliberal formulas among Third World countries for the purpose of bringing more foreign capital, the counterproductive effects of such an attempt would entail serious negative consequences for the socioeconomic future of those countries.

One of the new financing mechanisms that one often hears mentioned lately is called the debt-for-nature swap. By virtue of that principle, part of the foreign debt of a underdeveloped country can be purchased by foreign governments or nongovernment organizations at a certain discount. The equivalent of that debt, sometimes at a discount, in the national currency of the country in

question could then be invested in the debtor country in programs to conserve the environment, which would include the establishment of protected areas.

Up until now, the true scope of those programs have been rather limited. According to a report by the U.S. Congress, from 1986 to 1990, a total of 27 such operations were conducted in 13 underdeveloped countries. The nominal value of the recovered debt totaled $125 million, which amounts to less than .5 percent of the total debt of those countries. Two-thirds of the foreign debt that has been swapped in Costa Rica only reduced its foreign debt by 2 percent.

The debt-for-nature swap, regardless of the good intentions of environmentalists, does not resolve the following problems. First, it does not solve the problem of the debt as it does not attack the causes that generate it. But, above all, it entails the potential loss of sovereignty of the country in question, especially when the agreements achieved restrict the rights of the debtor state over specific natural resources or areas that have been declared as protected by way of this procedure. This mechanism also suffers from the negative aspects typical of every foreign debt capitalization transaction, such as the inflationary impact on the economy of the debtor country, among others. In general, in these programs, the projects of interest to the party that promotes the transaction or those of international importance receive priority. These programs, in many cases, are not those which may interest underdeveloped countries.

In addition to the bilateral debt-for-nature transactions, the possibility to create a multilateral organization that, through a central fund, would purchase debts at a discount and would use these securities [titulos] to finance sustainable development programs through negotiations with debtor countries has been analyzed. Even in this manner, it appears evident that the debt-for-nature swap programs are far from being the right mechanism to connect a fair solution to the problem of the debt with the efforts to face the problems of the environment in the Third World.

The serious financial difficulties of the underdeveloped countries to confront the problems of the environment and development have an important significance on examining the existing limitations to the transfer of technologies environmentally proper for the Third World. During the past decade, characterized by the negative impact of the foreign debt on the Third World, a growing displacement of these nations in the flow of technological transfer occurred, encompassing both trade of capital goods and foreign direct investments and technical assistance.

Given the fragile nature of the ecosystems of underdeveloped nations and the scarce resources these countries have to face the deterioration of the environment, the transfer of environmentally proper technologies represent a basic component of sustainable development. Among the most common obstacles to the transfer of state-of-the-art technologies to underdeveloped countries are—in addition to the financial restrictions associated directly or indirectly with the debt problem—the deficit of qualified labor force and the lack of an adequate infrastructure to secure the dissemination of the new technologies.

As a result of the profound transformations associated with the current scientific-technical revolution, important changes in the corporate strategies of multinational companies have occurred. These strategies favor the formation of strategic alliances between firms based in developed countries to face the high costs of research and development, as well as to guarantee greater protection for the rights of intellectual property. This reinforces the transfer of advanced technologies between these corporations, which cooperate among themselves, thereby affecting the transfer of technologies to the Third World.

These new corporate strategies have received great support from the commercial policies of industrialized countries. Indeed, the governments of these countries, particularly that of the United States, have exerted great pressure on the negotiations at the Uruguayan Round to liberalize the services and impose stricter and more uniform regulations to protect the rights of intellectual property.

The establishment of these kinds of protection systems would translate into an increase in the price of imported technologies, especially in the case of industries that make frequent use of patents. This would demand the use of additional resources on the part of underdeveloped countries, which must be considered in the new agreements and protocols that are signed concerning environmental protection.

As the demand for environmentally safe technologies is determined to a great extent by the specific geographical and socioeconomic conditions of the underdeveloped countries, in many cases, these technologies cannot be transferred from abroad. Consequently, it is necessary to develop internal technological capabilities that will allow us—in addition to assimilating—to adapt and develop imported technologies, create a new understanding, and generate our own technologies.

In view of the underdeveloped countries' financial and technological vulnerability, we can no longer delay the establishment of international pledges guaranteeing the basic conditions for the economies of the South to make the transition to sustainable patterns of development. Otherwise, the vicious circle that exists between underdevelopment, poverty, and environmental deterioration will be perpetuated, with serious ecological and socioeconomic consequences, not only for the Third World but for all of humanity.

Sustainable Development, Neoliberalism, and Environment

Taking advantage of important changes in the correlation of economic and political forces at an international

level, the industrialized countries are insisting on the global nature of environmental problems for the obvious purpose of watering down their huge responsibility within a worldwide framework and, based on this, are making burdensome demands on the Third World. An effort is thus being made to turn the process of internationalizing the ecology movement into just another element of the prospective new world order.

As is well-known, in the heat of the international debate and in the context of the process of internationalizing ecological awareness, the concept of "sustainable development," has been widely disseminated. This concept is interpreted as development capable of fulfilling current needs without affecting the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It cannot be denied that the idea conceives development as a harmonious process in which the exploitation of resources, investments, technological change, and institutional transformations must be in keeping with the needs of the planet's current population and its future inhabitants. The concept of sustainable development is an effort to define a higher, more egalitarian, and humane form of development.

The concept of sustainable development has been a success because it places the ecological problem in a relevant position and establishes the need for global action, transcending the present and projecting to the future the urgency of protecting the natural foundation of life. It views poverty as a situation of inequality that must be fully defeated, and it accurately portrays demographic growth as a consequence of poverty. The ecology-development binomial is not interpreted as an irreconcilable dichotomy, but as interconnected elements.

Nevertheless, despite its increasingly widespread acceptance, the theory of sustainable development is not exempt from contradictions and limitations. One of them is its ambiguous nature in that it identifies the social disparities existing in the current world, but does not recognize the mechanisms that have generated that inequality. A consistent interpretation of sustainable development must originate from the acknowledgment that underdevelopment is the consequence of the looting of the Third World, prolonged in our times by an international economic order that takes advantage of the mechanisms of indebtedness, the unfair international division of work, commercial protectionism and the use of financial flow to intensify the exploitation of the underdeveloped countries and, therefore, the consequent ecological depredation resulting from this situation.

Meanwhile, there is a trend toward viewing sustainable development as a method where it is possible to reconcile the conservation of the environment, social equality, economic growth, and the forces of the market. It is not difficult to perceive the aura of a new utopia where the sustainable development concept would be determined by the will of the market forces to guarantee a balanced and egalitarian socioeconomic and environmental development, which would entail a danger for the underdeveloped countries' socioeconomic future entailed in the "green market" idea.

The "green market" concept, which reveals the presence of the fatal neoliberal seal on the discussions of environment and development, tends to favor those economic agents interested in legalizing the right to damage the environment and to commercialize that right.

There are also attempts to impose another limitation on the heretofore practical implementation of the thesis of sustainable development: the suggestion that multilateral agencies dominated by more developed countries, which are responsible in a great measure for the activities that cause more deterioration to the world's ecology, should be in charge of the transition to a more harmonious, equitable, and ecologically safe development. The guidelines for a "sustainable" social and economic development process are based on the assumption that it will achieve an international atmosphere of understanding, justice, and equity. The recognition that the whole world is responsible for a solution to the leading ecological problems will undoubtedly tend to unite the nations in the search for joint solutions.

However, the consensus disappears when it is time to determine responsibilities among nations and establish commitments concerning essential international cooperation, trade regulations, foreign aid, and the transfer of technologies, among other issues. The international popularity achieved by neoliberal speeches and customs in the early 1980's, together with the emergence of old theories about a "perfect market," had a considerable effect on the world's ecological debate. The reappearance of the philosophy that free enterprise is an infallible formula to correct economic imbalances has been sponsored by specific conservative political groups that have prevailed since early in the last decade in some highly industrialized states, such as the United States and the United Kingdom.

Referring to ecological issues, although international practice has proven the governments' active participation in the protection of natural resources is irreplaceable, those who sponsor the idea of a "green market" minimize the state's role in ecological issues. They circumvent the existing contradiction between short-term commercial interests, which tend to accelerate the depredation of natural resources and the necessary protection of those same natural resources according to society's long-term interests.

In fact, certain states and groups are currently trying to impose the idea about a "green market" in the relations between developed and underdeveloped countries, under the pretext of countering the world's ecological challenges. For example, there is a proposal to establish and commercialize permits at the international level for

the emission of polluting gases. If this becomes generalized, it might have very negative effects for the future of underdeveloped nations.

Generally speaking, the strong pressure exerted at the international level to increase the area of action of neoliberal policies is very worrisome, above all when this is imposed on underdeveloped nations or when it becomes part of North-South relations. Referring to this, it is important to emphasize the highly negative ecological impact caused by the monetarist, restrictive, opportunistic, and privatizing guidelines that characterize macroeconomic adjustment programs recommended by the IMF to debtor countries.

These adjustment programs suggest, among other things, cutting public expenses and achieving a foreign trade balance at all costs, in order to guarantee foreign debt service payments. The programs likewise suggest the reduction of the state's participation in the economy to a minimum, based on the neoliberal policy that state activities are intrinsically inefficient. They advocate a large-scale privatization process.

Investments for the ecology's protection become one of the first issues to be postponed as a result of the cut in public expenses. Also, the recourse of increasing export volumes, at the expense of excessively exploiting renewable and nonrenewable natural resources, is frequently part of the efforts to balance the foreign trade balance at all costs. However, these efforts do not always yield the expected results.

Recent studies to analyze the social and economic impact of the IMF's adjustment programs reveal that the international financial organization's formulas not only ignore poverty and ecology problems but also encourage underdeveloped countries to disregard these two problems as much as possible.

One of these studies shows that 78 percent of the 48 IMF adjustment programs implemented from 1986 to 1990 included a reduction of public expenditures, particularly in the social field.

This is how the debtor countries' governments met this demand. Budgets for housing, public health, or economic assistance were reduced in 92 of the countries, 62 percent reduced the funds earmarked for two of the three sectors mentioned earlier, and 29 percent cut all funds for social expenses by more than 20 percent.

These adjustment programs not only have a high environmental direct cost, but are a fundamental factor in increasing social imbalance, particularly the poverty that has afflicted developing countries in recent years. Thus, these programs also contribute indirectly to the environment's degradation. No doubt, the neoliberal adjustment formulas are an essential link in the crisis that in the 1980's completed the chain of compelling factors in the structural poverty that accompanies, from the beginning, any undeveloped economy.

Ecological Policy and Cuban Reality

The concern over protection and conservation of natural resources, regarded as a patrimony of all the people, was born in Cuba since the 1959 revolution's triumph. The efforts in the early years to restore the forests, devastated during the colonization years and later, during the expansion of sugarcane and cattle latifundios, are worth mentioning.

In Cuba, a socialist country, the environment and natural resources are a shared patrimony of the society and are, therefore, of special interest for the nation as a whole. Consequently, the entire society devotes attention to environmental problems. The Constitution of the Republic, promulgated in 1976 after it was approved in a referendum, expressly makes it mandatory for the state and every citizen to protect the country's environment and natural resources. In 1981, the People's Government National Assembly, the country's highest legislative body, approved a law to protect the environment and ensure the rational use of natural resources. The so-called National Protection System was approved in 1990 as a continuation of the activities leading to the creation of a standard system for the protection of the environment.

A National Commission for the Protection of the Environment and the Rational Use of the National Resources, formed by representatives of various state institutions and civilian circles, was created in 1977. Similar committees were created in every province and municipality in the country in 1980.

The radical social change effected by the Cuban revolution has directly and favorably influenced the environment by transforming the living conditions, thereby creating the requirements so that man is not forced to attack the environment. Access to work, the development of a broad health system based on man's well-being, and the marked elevation of the population's general education level, as well as technical and professional qualifications, have played a fundamental role in environmental protection.

On this basis and over 30 years of revolution, important environmental achievements have been attained, such as the recovery and adequate use of hydraulic resources, the creation of a vast system of parks and protected areas, and the application of consistent policies for the protection of flora and fauna and biodiversity, among many others that could be mentioned. Considerable environmental problems still persist in the country, however. Efforts are being made to control and solve them.

One of these problems deals with pollution centers in bays. In the case of the Bay of Havana, valuable international cooperation has been received for diagnosing the problem and applying a solution. An effort has been made to reverse the situation of some degraded and eroded soils, particularly in mining areas. We have also

been working on the solution of some local problems dealing with the pollution of surface waters, mainly by the sugar industry's runoff.

Progress has been achieved in the recovery of beaches and coastal areas damaged by erosion. One work of considerable scope is the so-called southern dam in Havana Province. Its recent completion will stop and reverse the salinization process in tens of thousands of hectares of potentially arable land. Also, water resources, vital in meeting water requirements for agriculture, industry, and the population of Havana will be recovered.

From the moment that tourism, as a tool for the country's development in its specific situation, was given a strategic priority status, all the infrastructure work on beaches, keys, and other potential tourist zones was carried out following a careful evaluation of the environmental impact these works could have. There is permanent and strict control on tourism-related investments. Cuba's favorable environmental conditions are fundamental premises in the tourist industry's development plans, which include a significant achievement of strictly ecological tourism.

Another environmental field that is receiving priority attention in Cuba is the sea beds. In this regard, we can point to the strict measures being implemented to protect coral ridges.

In today's Cuba, increased and widespread ecological awareness is one of the most important means available for the protection of the environment. Consistent implementation of these policies has produced significant accomplishments. In the past 30 years, the country's forest areas have increased from 14 percent to 20 percent, and there are plans to plant 1.5 billion trees in the current five-year period. There is no significant atmospheric contamination problem in Cuba.

The first actions aimed at securing an integral utilization of the country's mountain regions were initiated in the 1960's. Today, this program, which together with the programs to protect the environment, is aimed at: improving rural communication, safeguarding cultural values, and improving the people's standard of living. It is being implemented in all the mountain regions of Cuba, which cover 18 percent of the national territory. Forest restoration and coffee and cacao plantation increases which have resulted from this are notable and have had significant social rewards. In recent years, the process of migration to the cities is beginning to turn around in almost all of the country's mountain regions.

The development secured by Cuban society is expressed by the people's collective equity and participation. Foreign experts have reached illustrative conclusions on this through independent research. The annual per capita GNP [gross national product] growth between 1960 and 1985 was 3.1 percent. The lower income sector—40 percent of the population—receives 26 percent of the total income. In 1986, the Gini income distribution quotient—an internationally acknowledged statistic scale for measuring degrees of income equity—was 0.22. This places Cuba among the most equitable countries in the world in this aspect.

Cuba's equity is guaranteed also by the collective and extensive access that the Cuban people have to fundamental social services that determine the standard and quality of living. This situation is perfectly measurable by well-known indicators. Some people could be surprised by the fact that in the past 30 years, Cubans, whose per capita income is 10 times smaller than those of the seven most industrialized countries, have secured health and education levels that are similar, and in some cases superior, to those of the seven most developed countries of the world. For example:

life expectancy, somewhat more than 75 years of age, is similar to that of developed countries;
in Cuba there are more doctors per population than in those countries as a whole;
the number of births attended by medical personnel is the same;
the percentage of children given immunity against the most notorious diseases is higher in Cuba;
elementary and secondary school education is similar, and the number of compulsory years in school is the same.

If this comparison with the world's richest countries were not enough to convince anyone of the equitable nature of Cuban society, then we could also take a look at how these indicators fluctuate in the country's various regions.

If the differences between national and provincial figures on the main social indexes are observed, it will be seen that the minimum and maximum variations for each of these indexes are usually small. This means that these national averages do not mask large regional differences. Maximum indexes, which show the indicators at their best, are rarely found in the capital. On the contrary, these indexes often appear in areas that were among the country's most undeveloped before the revolution.

At present, Cuba faces the most difficult challenge in its history. We all know that the changes in the old socialist countries of Eastern Europe, as well as in what is now the former Soviet Union, have had strong repercussions on Cuba's economy. Approximately 85 percent of Cuba's trade was with these countries. For this reason, in addition to the aggravated blockade that the United States has applied for over 30 years, our country must suffer the effects of a second blockade brought about by these international changes.

In September 1990 the so-called special peacetime period was established, which was a process to readjust for these challenges. It demanded the greatest rationality and austerity of economic and social policies as well as the application of numerous creative initiatives, many of them originated by the people. Many of the measures taken, conditioned by the special peacetime period, fit strategies outlined by the revolution. Some of these

initiatives have contributed to expediting the application of policies in the country to defend the environment. One example of this is the measures taken to cope with the reduction of imported crude oil.

The most marked feature of these measures is that the country has succeeded in dealing with the necessary reduction of energy consumption with formulas to guarantee social equity and the people's participation, with significant benefits from the ecological viewpoint. The price was not raised in order to reduce the consumption of electricity in homes. Such a raise would have affected the sectors with the least income. However, a top consumption figure was established, with variations in accordance with the past average consumption. Families were aware of this information and were able to plan the necessary reduction of consumption.

Regarding transportation, a novelty solution was introduced with the mass import of hundreds of thousands of bicycles. Several plants were modified to manufacture them locally, and nearly 1 million of these vehicles have been distributed to workers and students. The proliferation of cyclists of all ages is perfectly consistent with the policies implemented for years for the health of all, including gymnastics programs for the elderly. Thus, the current fuel shortage, although it affects daily life, has had a positive effect on the environment.

Other examples of this nature, involving collective solutions that are valuable from the ecological viewpoint, are the increased use of natural medicine extracted from plants and leaves, the creation of small vegetable gardens—even in residential areas—taking advantage of gardens and terraces, the increasing use of animal power in agriculture, the development of earthworm breeding, and many others.

As an alternative solution to the difficulties encountered in the special peacetime period, it is possible for our country to capitalize on one of our most important attainments: the technical and scientific qualifications of the people. The results of priority investment in the formation of human resources are significant in the country. This is expressed in cultural wealth that leads to important yields from scientific research and the immediate application to production of formulas harmless to the environment.

During the special peacetime period, it has also become necessary to seek alternative solutions in agricultural and livestock production by markedly lowering the import of chemical fertilizers and pesticides as well as cattle fodder.

Several results of the scientific research done in recent years are quickly being put into practice. Because of their ecological value and degree of generalization, the most outstanding ones are: organic fertilizers such as Azotobacter, Ryzobium, and Micorriza; the development of biological plague and disease controls, particularly in the reproduction centers of the entomophagous and entomopathogenous varieties, of which a broad network has been quickly produced; the search for solutions involving animal feed, such as a system of rational rotation of feeding grounds for livestock and natural fertilization by cattle; the preparation of fodder from sugarcane or the by-products of the sugar industry; and other new solutions that have been implemented very quickly throughout the country once its viability and advisability have been determined.

In the case of the sugar industry—the main industrial item of the country—great progress has been made in the treatment of residue and its use, not only for animal fodder, but for other uses such as new sources of energy, irrigation with fertilizers [fertirriego], and paper production.

The rhythm and intensification of these solutions is only possible due to the accumulation of knowledge. Its ecological convergence is not casual either, but rather it responds to a defined strategy of development that has known how to harmonize care for the environment with economic and social progress.

An Action Proposal

The potential of scientific research and of qualified human resources that Cuba has allows it to turn into specific actions its willingness to cooperate as much as possible with the United Nations and other government and nongovernmental organizations in programs of environmental and social assistance to countries of the Third World. Therefore, a first proposal is to offer technical staff in areas such as health, education, agricultural, and environmental protection, among others, and the decision of offering all the possible cooperation in the sphere of scientific research where Cuba has made considerable progress.

There is no doubt that the Biodiversity Convention submitted to this conference as well as the subsequent steps that derive from it represent a valuable effort directed toward the protection of current and future resources that will come from biodiversity as well as from the safe and rational use of the results of biotechnological research. However it seems certain that under the present circumstances, the countries of the Third World need to develop and strengthen their cooperation in these fields. This is why Cuba has considered it appropriate to propose the creation of a permanent forum of the South on the protection and conservation of biodiversity and access to the development of biotechnology.

What is being sought with this proposal is the creation of a mechanism for consultation and the conciliation of ideas and projects, devoid of a bureaucratic infrastructure, that would be capable of giving underdeveloped countries the opportunity of continuing the debate on these topics of such vital significance to them and of forming common criteria with views to the conference of the parties that will be formed as soon as the agreement

is ratified. This permanent forum might center the attention of its analysis on issues, among others, as follows:

the establishment of a common system of legal protection on genetic resources that will include appropriate procedures of compensation for the access to these resources;

the establishment of common mechanisms capable of promoting access to the biotechnologies developed from genetic resources that have been provided;

the creation of advisory capabilities by Third World countries that will show greater advances in the scientific sphere, including the technical training of staff and the exchange of experts in various fields of sciences;

the establishment of common criteria on the defense of the indigenous peoples and their identities—their forms of life, culture, language, traditions—and on their secular wisdom in the vital connection with the environment;

the elaboration of common mechanisms of protection against the introduction of modified organisms that could be potentially dangerous.

We should study the establishment of judicial advisory capabilities to legally protect the natural resources and results of investigations conducted in Third World countries.

Along with this consultation system, we could consider the possibility of establishing a center for the conservation of the biodiversity of the countries of the South, in which all of the countries that signed the biodiversity agreement at this conference could participate. Its headquarters would be in a country that has rich biological diversity.

Brazil, an efficient and appropriate host for this meeting, would undoubtedly be a good selection for this purpose. The main goals of this center would be the natural preservation of diverse ecosystems and the ex situ preservation of tropical genetic resources.

In the 20 years since the first environmental meeting in Stockholm, the world population has increased by 1.6 billion; 80 percent are in the Third World. Extreme poverty spread to more than 1 billion human beings. Hunger reached unforeseen dimensions. Contagious and poverty-related diseases affected hundreds of millions of people. During that period, almost 250 million children under the age of five died in the Third World, and approximately 10 million women died from childbirth-related causes.

During those years, the world lost 480 billion metric tons of farming soil, 300 million hectares of forests were razed, and deserts increased by more than 120 million hectares. The per capita production of food remained the same or decreased in the Third World, innumerable sources of water were contaminated or exhausted, and tens of thousands of animal and vegetable species were extinguished.

Now we must establish a global system of environmental safety with the agreement and participation of all the nations. Much has been said in political and military terms regarding global safety. Huge military forces have been created in the search for it. Millions of minds have been sacrificed in its interest and have born the fundamental burden of the scientific investigations worldwide. We have dilapidated essential resources that were to be used in the event of an economic and social disaster in the underdeveloped world, the political, social, and ecological results of which are foreseeable. Under the present conditions and with the creation of a true climate of peace and international detente, global security would depend on the protection of nature, which involves us all, and the effective solution of underdevelopment and poverty in the Third World.

Humanity can still detain or reverse the destructive process of aggression against the environment. I must ask, nevertheless, how long they have. If the current trend continues, within the next 40 years the world population will have doubled, the climate will have undergone profound and irreversible alterations, and tropical forests will have virtually disappeared. Immense deserts and sterile and degraded lands will replace a large part of the lands that currently serve for farming or cattle breeding. Pure water will be rare or impossible to find in entire regions, and hunger will be uncontainable and irreparable.

There are individuals who, for political and economic reasons, minimize the seriousness of these problems. The insensitive attitude assumed years ago by people who attempted to seek shelter in positions of privilege marked by opulence, waste, and consumerism, led humanity to the crossroad it now faces. If specific and effective measures are not taken while there is still time, man will face an uncertain future in which the developed and wealthy and the poor of the land will be united and equal because their existence will be threatened, and they will have no future.

We need, unquestionably, an unequivocal political commitment to resolve this crisis. We also need considerable financial resources that in present international conditions exist and can be obtained.

In the past 20 years, the world has wasted over $13 million [as received] on military expenses. Even in 1991, having overcome the Cold War and the threat of confrontation between the great powers, military spending reached almost $1 billion. There are the resources to finance these programs.

The success of this conference will be measured by the actions that result from it. We represent humanity, and

that moral duty, that political obligation, that exceptional and historical responsibility, demands decisions, specific measures, and a commitment that can no longer be delayed.

Cuban Official Refers to U.S. Isolation

PA1006215892 Havana PRENSA LATINA in Spanish 1631 GMT 10 Jun 92—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[By Javier Rodriguez]

[Text] Rio de Janeiro, 10 Jun (PL)—Vice Foreign Minister Ricardo Alarcon on 10 June accused the United States of trying to recolonize the Third World by taking advantage of resources that belong to poor countries.

During an interview with PRENSA LATINA, Alarcon deplored the U.S. stance against signing the Biodiversity Treaty, which has received the backing of practically all the states represented at the UN Conference on Environment and Development (Eco-92) [UNCED] in this city.

Alarcon, who is also the Cuban ambassador to the United Nations, stated that Washington wants to monopolize that sector to keep a copyright on intellectual breakthroughs that belong to mankind, secure profits for the major transnational companies, and control the Third World's mode of development.

After describing Washington as a factor that has hampered the conference since the preparatory meetings, he noted that the Earth has already suffered major damage caused by the capitalist countries' system of development. It is universally understood that the problems the planet is facing today are linked to the patterns of production and consumption that are the essence of the lifestyle of wealthy countries, he noted.

During the interview, which was held in the lobby of the hotel where Alarcon is staying, he recalled the need to modify international relations if one wants to reach profound solutions to the topics currently under debate.

The debates related to the environment and development basically bring to the fore the most serious crises of the system and the philosophy of capitalism, Alarcon stated.

Further on, he mentioned the current isolation of U.S. President George Bush, not just in the conference but in his country, too.

Alarcon referred to the concerns of U.S. citizens who are now seeing their forests destroyed, their cities' atmospheres polluted, and major problems emerging in the fields of health and education.

While those things are happening, Bush is giving his unrestricted support to big millionaires—to the detriment of the minorities—because he wants to receive funds for his reelection bid.

That is the case regarding the interests of U.S. logging companies, which have received his authorization to operate on federal lands that until now had been preserved as virgin forests.

Speaking again about the conference, Alarcon stated that what is most important, independent of the texts that may be approved, is the fact that it will begin a new phase.

This is not the end of a process but a beginning. It involves the presence of the people who provide assistance to thousands of nongovernmental organizations, as well as people from all over the world who arrived in Rio de Janeiro to state their views, he said.

In Alarcon's opinion, the process following Eco-92 will have to discuss effective measures to put and end to poverty and suffering in the underdeveloped nations. It would also entail a radical questioning of the new world order based on the capitalist philosophy, which created the environmental tragedy and underdevelopment.

If Bush does not sign the Eco-92 agreements, millions of U.S. citizens will know that they have to get rid of Bush, remove him from the Presidency, and change the U.S. Government, he stressed.

The Rio Conference, he concluded, is a battle that will live in the history of mankind as a decisive moment that will bring about a unprecedented movement of unforeseen scope for the salvation of the planet and the people who live on it.

Croatia's Greguric Discusses Ecological Problems

PY1506151692 Rio de Janeiro JORNAL DO BRASIL in Portuguese 14 Jun 92 p 18—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[By Nani Rubin]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] During the course of an interview, Croatian Prime Minister Franjo Greguric told JORNAL DO BRASIL that the ecological problem is linked to the destruction of monuments, cities, and natural resources that has been occurring in Croatia since it gained its independence, together with Slovenia, in June 1991. [passage omitted]

The prime minister stated that the fighting raging in several European cities, causing the return of fear that Europeans thought was dead and buried with the end of World War II, could have been prevented if international recognition had not been delayed so long.

He said: "The international community did not understand quickly enough what was happening. The community was taken in by the intense propaganda that came out of Belgrade (the capital of Serbia and Yugoslavia). This propaganda created the impression that we were to blame. Absorbed in the war effort, we had to react to the aggression that we were suffering; we did not have the time to tell the world what was really going on. We had

no diplomatic links with the rest of the world, and a certain amount of time is needed to organize these types of relations. We only had the help of the Croatian communities that live abroad, such as the community in Sao Paulo, to defend the reason for the country's independence." [passage omitted]

According to Greguric, the emergence of new leadership in Serbia, which might emerge due to the sanctions that have been imposed on the republic by the international community, would be the best way to overcome the impasse. "There is no point in discussing matters with Milosevic (Slobadan Milosevic, president of Serbia and Yugoslavia [as published], a former communist country) because he is the local Saddam, and he does not have the intention of negotiating anything," he said.

Regarding the opposition that is emerging in Serbia, the largest republic of the old Yugoslavia, which together with Montenegro now forms the new Yugoslav Federation, Greguric considers that it is still very small and unorganized.

Greguric openly defends a military intervention, which, in his opinion, could be carried out by UN troops if the situation is not resolved peacefully. He indicated this would be the only way to stop the fighting, which in Croatia alone has caused damage amounting to $21 billion, 5,000 dead, and 13,000 missing, of which 10,000 have been given up for dead. In addition, the fighting has created a refugee population of 274,000 Croatians and 300,000 Bosnians. [passage omitted]

Israeli Delegation Head Sums Up Earth Summit

TA1606083992 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 16 Jun 92 p 3—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Report by Liat Collins]

[Text] The head of the Israeli delegation to the UN Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro joined other participants yesterday in saying the summit would have been more successful if the US were a world leader in environmental issues.

Delegation head Uri Marinov, director-general of the Environment Ministry, said however that the summit, which ended Sunday [14 June], had ended on a more optimistic note than expected.

Environmentalists described the event as "historic" and "unprecedented" partly because of the participation of more than 100 heads of state.

Apart from the general achievements of the summit, the Israeli delegation was particularly pleased that no anti-Israel decisions were taken. An Environment Ministry spokesman said the delegation successfully prevented an attempt to discuss the "occupied territories."

The Rio Declaration refers to "the need to protect the environment of people under occupation" without specifically mentioning Israel.

The delegation also successfully prevented the PLO's Faruq Qaddumi from appearing as "The Palestinian Foreign Minister."

Marinov's opening statement presenting "The 10 Environmental Commandments" was well received.